

# THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of Eastern Churches Number of "Pax,"  
founded 1931.)

---

VOL. V

JANUARY-JUNE, 1943

Nos. 5 & 6

---

## CHRISTIAN WORSHIP IN THE EARLY FATHERS<sup>1</sup>

This paper was read at the Catholic Conference of Higher Studies, held at Upholland College, in Easter Week, 1943. It is now published at the request of many of its members. The subject of this paper has special bearing on our work, hence we welcomed it.

**W**ORSHIP is an essential element of true religion. It may be conveniently described as the public and corporate acknowledgment of that sense of "worth" or title to reverence and to gratitude, which man is convinced he owes to the Godhead; since, writes Lactantius<sup>2</sup>:

"We are born for this purpose, namely, to offer meet and just tribute of praise to God who has created us, to know Him, to follow Him. We are in fact bound to God (*religati Deo*) by the bonds of piety, whence religion itself has derived its name."

<sup>1</sup> Useful books of reference on this subject are: *Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgicae Reliquiae Vetustissimae*. By Dom F. Cabrol O.S.B. and Dom H. Leclercq. Vol. I Paris, 1900-1902; *L'Anaphore Apostolique et ses Témoins*, by Dom P. Cagin O.S.B., Paris, 1919; *Il Sacrificio Cristiano e la Liturgia della Messa*, by Dom E. Caronti, O.S.B., Turin, 1922; *Didascalia Apostolorum. The Syriac version translated and accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments*, by Dom H. Connolly O.S.B., Oxford, 1929; *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*, by Dom G. Dix, Monk of Nashdom Abbey, Vol. I, London, 1937; *Christian Worship*, by Mgr. L. Duchesne, fourth English ed., London, 1912; *How Christians Worship, Broadcast Talks*, edited by Eric Fenn, London, 1943; *The Mass. A Study of the Roman Liturgy*, by A. Fortescue, London, 1912; *Recent Discoveries Illustrating Early Christian Life and Worship*, by A. I. Maclean, London (S.P.C.K.), 1904; *L'Antica Liturgia Romana*, by I. Magani, 3 Vols., Milan, 1897-99; *Itinerario Liturgico*, by Dom I. Pérez de Urbel, Madrid, 1940; *Liturgie der drei ersten Christlichen Jahrhunderte*, by F. Probst, Tübingen, 1870; *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*, by F. E. Warren, London, 1897.

<sup>2</sup> *Divin. Institution.*, 4, 28, 2.

In practice worship has come to be synonymous with cult and is best expressed by the official rites regulating the actual rendering of honour, and of showing man's gratitude, to God. In doing this, the inner conviction of each worshipper as regards the debt he owes to God must needs overflow into the corporate act of worship. Such are the general principles underlying the theory and practice of all true worship.

But Christian Worship has had from the outset a definite character, all its own, derived directly from the teaching, example and explicit command of Christ Himself. In fact, to put it pithily, when Our Lord taught the Our Father to His disciples, He presented them with the first and best of breviaries; when at the Last Supper He commanded them: "Do this" or rather "sacrifice this in memory of Me," He dictated the first Canon of the Mass; when, finally, He sent them to baptize in the name of the Trinity and gave them authority to pardon sins, He compiled for them, as it were, the first Christian Ritual. Now, these three elements—the Sacrifice of the Mass, administration of the Sacraments and the Divine Office—are in fact the regulative factors for the whole official performance of Christian Worship.

This paper aims solely at establishing the teaching concerning both the theory and the practice of Christian Worship as found in the writings of the pre-Nicene Fathers, that is, from about the year 90 to the year 325. However, as this subject is very vast and patient of several kinds of treatment, I start by defining the limits within which it is to be considered here. First, I shall endeavour to move exclusively within the period proposed above: therefore I do not purpose to marshall, not even as an introduction, the passages of the New Testament bearing on this theme, although, of course, most of the patristic texts cannot be understood unless one bears those passages in mind. Again, only exceptionally shall I refer to the Fathers who were contemporaries of, or wrote immediately after, the council of Nicea. Much less shall I trespass on the exuberant field of the fifth century, where, from St. Augustine alone, we could compile a complete treatise on Christian Worship, both theoretical and practical. Secondly, much for the same reason, I scarcely draw any evidence from the liturgical compilations themselves, since they were definitively completed late in the fourth or early in the fifth century. However, it should be remarked that the patristic witness of the period under consideration is overwhelmingly larger for the practice than for the mere theory of Christian Worship. Thirdly, it will be useful to remind my hearers of the three main sub-divisions into which the pre-Nicene



epoch falls: (i) the sub-Apostolic time, 90 to c. 150; (ii) that of the Apologists c. 150 to c. 220; and (iii) that of the first successful attempts at presenting Christian theology clothed in the philosophical, chiefly neo-platonist, dress of the period, c. 220 to 325. Finally, all will understand that in writing on a subject like this one cannot well escape a certain amount of overlapping.

The whole of the patristic material dealt with in this paper may be conveniently grouped in a logical order under the following headings:

(i) The Worship of Christ's followers in the new economy of grace as distinct from, and completing, all others. Worship in general.

(ii) New sacramental birth and life in Christ. The Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord. Development of its ritual.

(iii) Corporate official prayer and minor Christian practices and observances.

## (i)

### *The Worship of Christ's Followers.*

#### *Worship in General.*

Christ founded His religion as the fulfilment and, to some extent, as the continuation of the Old Testament. Christianity was born, and initially grew, among the chosen nation. Soon, however, it passed on to the Gentiles. But naturally enough it retained sundry elements of the Jewish observance, chiefly as regards rite and ceremonial, so that the judaizing members for some time claimed a sort of adherence to the worship of the Old Testament. Therefore, one of the points which the Apostolic Fathers, following St. Paul, establish beyond doubt is that Christianity differs from Judaism definitely as regards ritual practices. They do so in no ambiguous terms. For example, they argue from the fact that Christians keep the Sunday instead of the Saturday as their day of worship. St. Ignatius simply describes the Jewish converts as "those who no longer observe the Sabbath but the Lord's day<sup>1</sup>" — *μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες*.

The Epistle of Barnabas gives the reason of the change<sup>2</sup>:

"Wherefore we also with gladness celebrate the eighth day in which Jesus rose from the dead and was made manifest."

<sup>1</sup> *Ad Magnesios*, ix, 1.

<sup>2</sup> xv, 9.

In the Didaché Sunday is already fixed for the weekly celebration of the Eucharist.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, according to Tertullian,<sup>2</sup> Christians were called Sun-Worshippers, because they kept the "Day of the Sun" (*dies Solis*) as their festive day (*dies laetitiae*). Other interesting witnesses to the observance of Sunday are St. Dionysius of Corinth (166-175),<sup>3</sup> Origen,<sup>4</sup> St. Cyprian,<sup>5</sup> and particularly the Acts of St. Dativus and Companions, Martyrs (304),<sup>6</sup> where *Celebrare Dominicum* already means both to celebrate the Eucharist and to observe the Lord's Day.

But the point of paramount importance which utterly separated Christian from Jewish and Pagan Worship was the profession of Christ's divinity, and indeed of the Three Persons in the one Godhead and the consequent adoration paid to them. This point the Fathers, particularly the Apologists, are at pains to proclaim and to prove. In sub-Apostolic times we already find St. Ignatius using the phrase δοξάζειν τὸ ὄνομα—To praise the Name, that is the Name of God given to Christ, and by this he means simply: To worship, or to give thanks to God-Christ. The pagan world was indeed intrigued and puzzled, utterly failing to understand this act of supreme worship by which, according to the testimony of Pliny the Younger in his letter to the Emperor Trajan,<sup>7</sup> Christians

"were accustomed to meet weekly and sing hymns to Christ as God" (*stato die ante lucem convenire carmenque Christo quasi Deo dicere*).

This fact, together with the rumour of clandestine banquets at night, accompanied by unnatural practices, led to two opposite calumnies being levelled against Christians: of being atheists and conversely of worshipping the head of an ass.

All the Apologists at much length explain away the calumny of atheism. Here are a few short passages. St. Athenagoras writes<sup>8</sup>:

"Who will not wonder when he hears styled atheists those who acknowledge God the Father, God the Son and the Holy Ghost and show that these three are one in power

1 xiv. κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ Κυρίου συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἄρτον . . .

2 *Apol.*, 16; *Ad Nationes*, I, 13.

3 Epistle to Pope St. Soter. *Apud Eusebium*, 2, 378.

4 *In Numeros*, Hom. xxiii, 4. (How to keep the Sunday—very interesting.)

5 *De Opere et Eleemosynis*, xv.

6 *Passim*.

7 The letter may be found in most Manuals of Church History. Tertullian quotes it too in *Apol.*, 2.

8 *Apol. cap. x.*



and distinct in order ? ”  
and St. Melito of Sardis<sup>1</sup> :

“ We are more reasonable than they who worship dead stones, since we worship God alone, who was before all and in all things, as also His Christ, who is God the Word before all time.”

Aristides says simply<sup>2</sup> :

“ We profess that He who was crucified in His body is God and we worship Him.”

Similar testimonies abound in St. Justin, St.<sup>3</sup> Theophilus of Antioch,<sup>4</sup> St. Irenaeus,<sup>5</sup> and in almost all the genuine Acts of the Martyrs.<sup>6</sup>

This specific Christian worship of the Trinity found liturgical expression in the manifold and magnificent doxologies wherein adoration, thanksgiving and praise are offered

“ to God the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Ghost.”

(τῷ Θεῷ Πατρὶ, διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἐν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι).

I have collected over fifty different forms from the writings of the Fathers under consideration. The Didaché,<sup>7</sup> St. Clement of Rome,<sup>8</sup> The Acts of the Martyrdom of St. Polycarp,<sup>9</sup> of the Scilitan Martyrs,<sup>10</sup> of St. Carpus, St. Irenaeus,<sup>11</sup> Tertullian,<sup>12</sup> St. Hippolytus,<sup>13</sup> Origen,<sup>14</sup> Aphphrates the Syrian,<sup>15</sup> Dionysius of Alexandria,<sup>16</sup> have left choice examples. More-over the *φῶς ἱλαρόν*, the *Te decet laus* and the *Gloria in excelsis Deo* belong to this early period. I quote just one specimen from Clement of Alexandria<sup>17</sup> :

“ By day and by night, until the perfect day, let us in thanksgiving praise and with praise give thanks, to the Father and the Son alone, the Son and the Father, the Son our pedagogue and teacher, with the Holy Ghost. All things in Him alone. Through Whom all things are one ;

<sup>1</sup> *Fragmentum ex Apol. pro Christianis.*

<sup>2</sup> *Sermo* I, n. 5. (*Sancti Aristidis . . . Sermones duo, Venetiis, 1878*).

<sup>3</sup> *Apol.* I, vi, xiii.

<sup>4</sup> *Ad Autolycum*, Lib. I, cap. xi ; Lib. III, cap. xv.

<sup>5</sup> *Contra Hæreses*, I, iii, I ; II, XI, I ; II, xxviii, 3.

<sup>6</sup> Acts of St. Carpus and Co. ; Acts of St. Apollonius ; of St. Pionius of Smyrna ; of St. Crispina ; of St. Epulus, Deacon ; of St. Phileas of Thmuis. All may be found in Ruinart.

<sup>7</sup> ix, x.

<sup>8</sup> I Clement xxxviii, 4.

<sup>9</sup> n. xiv.

<sup>10</sup> *Sub. finem.*

<sup>11</sup> *Contra Hæreses*, I, III, i.

<sup>12</sup> *Adversus Praxeam*, 2.

<sup>13</sup> Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις, III ; *Contra Hæresim Noeti*, cap. xviii.

<sup>14</sup> *In Leviticum*, Hom. V, 12.

<sup>15</sup> *Demonstrationes*, 26, 61.

<sup>16</sup> *Apol.*, *conclusio*.

<sup>17</sup> *Pædag.*, *ad finem*.

through Whom is eternity. Whose members are we all, Whose glory are the ages."

The accusation of Christians being worshippers of the head of an ass was widespread. The curious *graffito* discovered in the Palatine—an ass nailed to a cross and underneath "Alexamenos the Christian worships his God"—is a characteristic example. Tertullian too records<sup>1</sup>:

"Some of you have dreamt that our God is an ass's head" (*caput asininum*), and narrates that in an African town the man in charge of the beasts of the amphitheatre had a design painted of the God of Christians with the inscription:

#### DEUS CHRISTIANORUM ONOKOITES.

"Is"—adds Tertullian—"erat auribus asininis, altero pede ungalatus, librum gestans et togatus."

To us these graphics, in spite of their pagan uncleanness, are an eloquent witness to the belief and worship of the primitive Christians. All are acquainted with the passage of Minutius Felix in which the still pagan Caecilius speaks of Christians, whom he styles the *latebrosa et lucifuga natio*, because they met at night for their worship, and says<sup>2</sup>:

"I hear that, prompted by I know not what ridiculous persuasion, they worship the head of an ass, the foulest of beasts . . . as well as the frightful beams of a cross, and a man sentenced for his crime to the vilest punishment . . . Then a child is killed, and horrible to say, they lap up (*lambunt*) his blood and cut off his members. . . Finally, why have they no altars, no temples, no statues? . . ."

The Christian Octavius answers at length, but chary of giving away the secret of the Christian mysteries, he refers exclusively to the interior acts of virtue, wherefrom all true Christian worship springs<sup>3</sup>:

"By what statue," he asks, "shall I represent God, since if you regard the matter aright, man himself is a statue of God? What temple shall I build for Him, when this wide world, fashioned by Him, is too small for Him? . . . Is it not better that our mind should be dedicated to Him, that our heart should be consecrated to Him. . . The best victim to offer Him is our good will and pure mind and upright conscience."

<sup>1</sup> *Apol.*, 16; *Ad Nationes*, I, 14.

<sup>2</sup> *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius*, Oxford, 1636, pp. 25 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 42 sqq.



There are other passages, few in number but couched in terms of singular beauty, wherein the Fathers, forgetful of controversial issues, set down the principles of true worship. Listen, for example, to Tertullian<sup>1</sup> :

“ We are the true adorers and the true priests, who communing with God offer up to Him the prayer due and acceptable to Him, which He Himself instituted. This we bring to the altar, overflowing from a full heart, nourished by faith, secure with truth, genuine with simplicity, pure with charity, crowned by the agape, accompanied by the pomp and circumstance of good works, clothed in psalms and hymns—a prayer which shall obtain for us all things from God.”

I end this first part with the two African writers Arnobius and Lactantius. Both wrote about the year 305. The theory of Christian worship is now fully developed. *Inter alia*, Arnobius has these noble lines<sup>2</sup> :

“ We Christians are nothing else than the worshippers of Christ, the supreme Teacher, Prince and King. When you come to think of it, you find nought else done in this religion. Before Him we all kneel, Him we adore in our united prayer, from Him we ask all things just and deserving and worthy of His hearing.”

Lactantius writes<sup>3</sup> :

“ We sum up the whole argument in this brief outline : the world was made in order that we should be born therein ; we are born in order to know the Creator of the world and of us ; we know Him in order to worship Him ; we worship Him in order to attain immortality as a reward for our labours, since the worship of God entails prolonged exercises ; we are crowned with immortality in order to become equal to the Angels and to serve for ever our supreme Father and Lord and become God's eternal kingdom. This is the sum total of all things, this is the secret of God, this is the mystery of the world.”

<sup>1</sup> *De Oratione*, n. 28.

<sup>2</sup> *Ad Nationes*, Lib. I, cap. xxvii.

<sup>3</sup> *Divin. Institution*. 7, 6, 1.

(ii)

*New Sacramental Birth and Life in Christ.  
The Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord.  
Development of its Ritual.*

Though mostly made up of unconnected passages widely scattered throughout their writings, the testimony of the early Fathers on the sacramental and sacrificial rites, wherein man is transformed and raised to a supernatural sphere so as to become God's true worshipper in the new economy of sanctification (*cultui Dei addicti, veri Dei adoratores*), is remarkably comprehensive and convincing. Indeed, it would be enough to piece together a few outstanding excerpts from the Didaché, St. Justin, Tertullian, St. Hippolytus and St. Cyprian to compile a very interesting ritual for the religious observance of the first half of the third century.

Baptism and the Eucharist are the two Sacraments to which most of the writers of this period bear unmistakable witness which extends in fact to practically every item of their elaborate ceremonial.

Solemn Baptism, administered on the night of Holy Saturday and, exceptionally on Pentecost eve, was preceded by prolonged and careful instruction (St. Justin)<sup>1</sup>, by prayer and fasting on the part of the candidate himself, of the minister and of the faithful (Didaché,<sup>2</sup> St. Justin,<sup>3</sup> Tertullian<sup>4</sup>). Its minister was normally the Bishop (Tertullian)<sup>5</sup> or a priest. Shortly before the actual administration of Baptism, the candidate was presented to the Bishop, who signed him on the forehead (*consignatio*) with the sign of the cross (Tertullian<sup>6</sup>). This was followed by the threefold renunciation of Satan, his pomps and his angels (Tertullian<sup>7</sup>). The Sacrament was now administered with a threefold immersion (*ter mergimur*) (Tertullian,<sup>8</sup> St. Hippolytus<sup>9</sup>) and that, in the earlier part of our period, in running water (Didaché)<sup>10</sup>; if this was not convenient, in any other water (Didaché, *alii passim*). The form mentioned by all was identical (Didaché, St. Justin, Tertullian, St. Hippolytus). Baptism was followed by Confirmation.

<sup>1</sup> *I Apol.*, cap. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Cap. viii.

<sup>3</sup> *I Apol.*, cap. 61.

<sup>4</sup> *De Baptismo*, 9. *De Corona Militis*, cap. iii.

<sup>5</sup> *De Bapt.*, 17.

<sup>6</sup> *De Corona Militis*.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>9</sup> See Dom Dix, *The Treatise of St. Hippolytus*, etc., p. 37.

<sup>10</sup> Cap. viii.



There were minor variants as regards other ceremonies : for example, "the laying on of hand" (the Fathers use the singular rather than the plural) twice, before and after Baptism, of a twofold anointing of the candidate, also before and after the Sacrament, the kiss of peace, a second *consignatio* after Baptism (St. Hippolytus<sup>1</sup> : *Et consignans in frontem offerat osculum et dicat : Dominus tecum. Et ille qui signatus est dicat : Et cum spiritu tuo*). Also according to St. Hippolytus, each immersion was immediately preceded by an explicit profession of faith on each of the Three Divine Persons.

At the end of the ceremony each of the newly baptized was presented with a dish of milk and honey.<sup>2</sup>

"Milk and honey," writes St. Hippolytus, "(are) mingled together in fulfilment of the promise made to the Fathers, wherein He said : I will give you a land flowing with milk and honey ; which Christ indeed gave, even His Flesh, whereby they who believe are nourished like little children. . ."

There is still in our present liturgy an allusion to this practice in the *Quasi modo geniti infantes lac concupiscite* of Low Sunday. (See Acts of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas.) Not until all this was over were the new Christians admitted to Holy Communion. The practice of administering Baptism to infants is mentioned by all : Origen in fact calls it an apostolic tradition.<sup>3</sup>

The patristic passages on the sacraments of penance, matrimony and Extreme Unction are rather scarce during this period and only indirectly connected with the subject of worship.

Just the opposite is to be said of the patristic witness to the central Act of Christian Worship, namely, the celebration of the Eucharist, considered under both its sacrificial and sacramental aspects. Most of the references to the sacrament of Ordination are to be found in the passages in which the Fathers speak of the Eucharist. I have collected some ninety excerpts from the pre-Nicene Fathers dealing with the celebration of the Eucharist. Not all, of course, are of equal value ; but all, whether directly or indirectly, show that from the very beginning the celebration of the Divine Mysteries—or the Liturgy, as it is called by the Greeks—was the supreme distinctive feature of Christian Worship and that all the other

<sup>1</sup> Dom Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

<sup>2</sup> Dom Dix, *op. cit.*, p. 40. See Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*, I, 14 ; *mellis et lactis societate, quos suos Ecclesia infantat*.

<sup>3</sup> *In Epist. ad Roman.*, Lib. V, cap. ix : *Ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare*. Cf. also *In Lucam*, Hom. xiv.

rites, including the solemn administration of the other Sacraments and the recitation of the Divine Office, were intimately connected with, or centred around, or derived from the re-enacting of the Sacrifice of the Cross upon the Christian altar. All those writers were fully aware of the tremendous truth which one of their number, St. Cyprian, expressed as follows<sup>1</sup> :

“The Priest indeed takes truly the place of Christ. That which Christ did, he also does and thus he offers up in the church a true and full sacrifice (*sacrificium verum et plenum*) to God the Father. . . Our Lord’s Passion, no less, is the sacrifice which we offer.”

The ritual of that great Act is described by St. Justin in two passages which have become classics in theology.<sup>2</sup> Its main constituents are the readings from the Old and New Testaments, preceded and followed by the singing of psalms, the homily, the offering by the faithful of the bread and wine of the Eucharist, prayer in silence, the kiss of peace, the great central Eucharistic Prayer—*Anaphora*, *Canon*—improvised by the celebrant according to a fixed canon within which the consecration takes place and ending with a final doxology in honour of the Holy Trinity, the recitation of the Lord’s Prayer, communion of all present and reservation of the “Broken Bread” to be carried by the Deacons to the absent. Collection for the needy and for the Church. The passages from the Didaché, St. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, are familiar, I expect, to you all : it is obviously out of the question to quote them all at length. I make an exception in favour of St. Hippolytus, the author of *The Apostolic Tradition*—Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις, written within the second decade of the third century (210–220). St. Hippolytus, a very difficult character who developed eventually into the first antipope, wrote his *Tradition* as an attack on ritual practices introduced into the Roman Church which he considered to be innovations. He purposely entitled his book *The Apostolic Tradition*, because therein he claims to give the reader, as he puts it, the *vertex traditionis*. He states—and there is no reason why his statement should be waved aside—that he is simply describing the rites as traditionally performed in Rome up to his time. He calls those rites “traditional and ancient, nay Apostolic.” It may well be inferred, therefore, that he is actually handing down to us excerpts from the Roman Missal and Ritual of the year, say, 150.

<sup>1</sup> Ep. 63. *Ad Cæcilian*. 14, 77.

<sup>2</sup> *I Apol.*, cc. lxxv–lxxvii.



The first part of the *Paradosis* deals with the election—called, as in all ancient documents, “*Ordinatio*”—and consecration of Bishops by the “laying on of the hand”—the prayer of consecration is exceptionally fine—with the Mass, with divers blessings, with priests, deacons, confessors (ὁμολογῆται), widows, readers, virgins, subdeacons. The second part treats of the laity, the ritual of Baptism being given in full. The third part is taken up with Church observances: the observance of Sunday, stational Masses, fasting, the agape, hours of prayer, the sign of the Cross, and finally certain minute regulations concerning the Eucharist.

May I be allowed to quote in full the great Eucharistic Prayer, which we now call the Canon<sup>1</sup>:

Illi vero offerant diacones oblationes, quique imponens manum in eam cum omni presbyterio dicat gratias agens (εὐχαριστῶν):

“Dnus vobiscum.”

et omnes dicant:

“Et cum spiritu tuo.”

“Sursum corda.”

“Habemus ad Dominum.”

“Gratias agamus Domino (εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ).”

“Dignum et justum est.”

et sic jam prosequatur:

“Gratias Tibi referimus, Deus, per dilectum Puerum tuum Jesum Xristum, quem in ultimis temporibus misisti nobis salvatorem et redemptorem et angelum voluntatis tue, qui est Verbum tuum inseparabilem (sic) per quem omnia fecisti et bene placitum Tibi fuit; misisti de coelo in matricem Virginis; quique in utero habitus incarnatus est et Filius Tibi ostensus est ex Spiritu Sancto et Virgine natus; qui voluntatem tuam complens et populum sanctum Tibi acquirens extendit manus cum pateretur ut a passione liberaret eos qui in te crediderunt. Qui cumque traderetur voluntariæ passioni ut mortem solvat et vincula diaboli disrumpat et infernum calcet et justos inluminet et terminum figat et resurrectionem manifestet, accipiens panem gratias Tibi agens dixit: Accipite et manducate: HOC EST CORPUS MEUM, QUOD PRO VOBIS CONFRINGITUR. Similiter et calicem dicens: HIC EST SANGUIS MEUS, QUI PRO VOBIS EFFUNDITUR: QUANDO HOC FACITIS, MEAM COMMEMORATIONEM FACITIS.

<sup>1</sup> Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις, cap. iv.

Memores igitur mortis et resurrectionis ejus offerimus Tibi panem et calicem gratias Tibi agentes (Εὐχαριστοῦντές Σοι) quia nos dignos habuisti stare coram Te et Tibi ministrare (ιερατεύειν—*fungi sacerdotio*). Et petimus ut mittas Spiritum tuum Sanctum in oblationem sanctae Ecclesiae; in unum congregans des omnibus qui percipiunt sanctis in repletionem Sancti Spiritus ad confirmationem fidei in veritate: ut Te laudemus et glorificemus per Puerum tuum Jesum Xristum, per Quem Tibi gloria et honor Deo Patri et Filio cum Sancto Spiritu in sancta Ecclesia tua et nunc et saecula saeculorum. Amen.”

The patristic witness of this period extends to derivative points of theory and practice concerning the Christian Sacrifice of the Mass, including its fourfold purpose—to adore, to give thanks, to pray and to atone (Origen,<sup>1</sup> St. Cyprian,<sup>2</sup> Claudius Apollinaris,<sup>3</sup>), the sacrifice offered for the dead (St. Cyprian<sup>4</sup>); feastdays, especially Easter and Pentecost (Origen,<sup>5</sup> St. Gregory Thaumaturgus,<sup>6</sup> *et passim*); the cult of Martyrs (Catacombs, Acts of Martyrs,<sup>7</sup> Origen,<sup>8</sup> Commodianus,<sup>9</sup> St. Cyprian<sup>10</sup>); the cult of Angels (Origen<sup>11</sup>); ordination rites and hierarchical rank (St. Clement of Rome,<sup>12</sup> St. Ignatius, *passim*, Didaché,<sup>13</sup> Popes St. Victor I,<sup>14</sup> The Shepherd,<sup>15</sup> St. Cornelius,<sup>16</sup> Origen<sup>17</sup>); time of the Eucharistic Synaxis (Clement of Alexandria<sup>18</sup>); even to the collection (St. Justin,<sup>19</sup> Tertullian<sup>20</sup>) and attendance at sermons (Origen<sup>21</sup>). As regards the special sacerdotal

<sup>1</sup> *In Numeros.* Hom. x, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Ep. 66.

<sup>3</sup> *De Paschate.*

<sup>4</sup> Ep. 66.

<sup>5</sup> *Contra Celsum*, viii, 21, 22.

<sup>6</sup> *Homiliae et Sermones*, *passim*.

<sup>7</sup> See especially the *Acts of St. Polycarp*, n. xvii, and of St. Pionius, as also the *Epistle of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons*, the *Acts of the Scilitan Martyrs*, of SS. Carpus and Companions, *Martyrs*, of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas, etc.

<sup>8</sup> *In Cantica*, Lib. III; *In Epist. ad Roman.*, Lib. IX, cap. xii; *Exhort. ad Martyrium*, n. 30.

<sup>9</sup> *Instructionum Libri II*, cap. xvii, v, 19.

<sup>10</sup> Epist. 34, n. 3; Epist. 37, *passim*; Ep. 54, n. 3; Ep. 56, 1.

<sup>11</sup> *Contra Celsum*, viii, 57, 67.

<sup>12</sup> *I Clement.*, xl.

<sup>13</sup> Cap. xv.

<sup>14</sup> *De Aleatoribus*, n. 3.

<sup>15</sup> *Vis. III*, cap. 5, 1.

<sup>16</sup> *Epist. ad Fabium*, 3.

<sup>17</sup> *In Leviticum*, Hom. vi, 3; Hom. ix, 9; see also Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, Lib. vii, cap. i.

<sup>18</sup> *Strom.*, Lib. IV, cap. xxv.

<sup>19</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>20</sup> *Apol.*, cap. 39. The whole passage should be read.

<sup>21</sup> *In Genesim*, Hom. x, i.



vestments at the celebration of Mass there is only one, rather vague, text of Origen<sup>1</sup> which mentions them.

A passing reference should be made of the inscriptions and symbols of the Catacombs, bearing on the Eucharist, some of which are indeed unrivalled, e.g. NUTRICATUS DEO CHRISTO—Nourished with Christ God, and also of the two famous epitaphs of Pectorius and Abercius with their symbolical reference to the Eucharistic  $\text{I}\chi\theta\upsilon\varsigma$ .

I conclude this part on an apologetic note. During the last sixty to eighty years there has been much talk concerning the influence of the older or contemporary Jewish or pagan rites on Christian ceremonial, especially on the baptismal and eucharistic celebrations. The Fathers of this period rarely refer to the Jewish influence, although the Alexandrians seem to take it for granted. As regards the pagan rites they are mentioned by St. Justin and Tertullian, but the latter simply turns the tables and accuses the worshippers of Mithra of aping the Christian Mysteries.<sup>2</sup> This must be added: That most of the specious theories, propounded in recent years on this subject, cannot stand the test of real scholarship.

As has been seen, actually the whole theory and practice of the Christian Sacrifice was a common possession of the faithful by the end of the third century.

## (iii)

### *Corporate official Prayer.*

#### *Minor Christian practices and observances.*

Another essential expression of worship is prayer, chiefly corporate, public and official prayer. Prayer, of course, is as natural to the human soul as breathing to the human body. Christians moreover had the explicit command of Christ in the Gospel and of Christ's disciples in the other writings of the New Testament. St. Paul put it very tersely: Pray without ceasing. The evidence of the pre-Nicene Fathers on this facet of Christian worship is very abundant and inspiring. Aristides, for example, describes Christian life, saying:<sup>3</sup>

“Every morning and at all hours they (Christians) praise and laud God for His goodness towards them.”

Even more than on private prayer the Fathers insist on Christians assisting at, and actively joining in, public liturgical prayer. St. Ignatius writes:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *In Leviticum*, Hom. iv, 6.

<sup>2</sup> *De Præscript*, cap. 40.

<sup>3</sup> See *The Apology of Aristides*, translated by Rendel Harris, 2nd ed., 1893, p. 93.

<sup>4</sup> *Ad. Ephesios*, ii, 1.

"Endeavour frequently to gather together in order to give thanks to God and to praise Him. For as often as you meet, Satan's wiles are weakened and by the accord of your faith the dangers which he devises are dispelled."

Again he says of official prayer :<sup>1</sup>

"Let no one err : if one is not within the altar, he is deprived of God's bread. For, if the prayer of one alone has such power, how much more that which is offered by the Bishop with the whole Church ? "

In several passages the great Martyr recommends his readers to<sup>2</sup>

"sing with one voice through Jesus Christ to the Father."

St. Cyprian never tires of stressing this great duty and privilege of the faithful :<sup>3</sup>

"We have," he says, "a public and common prayer, and when we pray, we do so not for one only but for the whole people, for we all—the whole people, are one." (*Publica est nobis et communis oratio, et quando oramus, non pro uno, sed pro toto populo oramus, quia totus populus unum sumus*).

I have just quoted St. Cyprian on the *Oratione Dominica*. In fact the most telling patristic testimonies of this time on prayer, both private and corporate but especially the latter, are the three priceless treatises of Tertullian, Origen and St. Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer, which Tertullian indeed describes as the "Breviary of the whole Gospel"—*Breviarium totius Evangelii*. Already in the Didaché—Christians are exhorted to recite the Our Father thrice daily. Tertullian specifies the hours : terce, sext and none, and gives the reason :<sup>4</sup>

"in order that at least three times we may adore God, thus paying our debt to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost."

As a matter of course, from the very beginning the Our Father is to be found forming an integral part of all the eucharistic synaxeries and sacramentaries, as well as of the baptismal ceremonies, where the *Traditio Oracionis Dominicae* constituted a distinctive feature ; it also formed part of the Divine Office. In most Eastern liturgies the people recited, and still recite, it aloud with the Priest. But perhaps the most impressive use was that of the Church of Spain. The people answered each petition of the Lord's prayer, as follows :

<sup>1</sup> *Ibidem*, v ; 2, 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibidem*, iv, 2.

<sup>3</sup> *De Oratione Dominica*, cap. viii.

<sup>4</sup> *De Oratione*, n. 25.



℣ *Pater noster qui es in coelis.*

℞ *Amen.*

℣ *Sanctificetur Nomen tuum.*

℞ *Amen.*

℣ *Adveniat regnum tuum.*

℞ *Amen.*

℣ *Fiat voluntas tua sicut in coelo et in terra.*

℞ *Amen.*

℣ *Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie.*

℞ *Quia Deus es.*

℣ *Et dimitte nobis debita nostra sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.*

℞ *Amen.*

℣ *Et ne nos inducas in tentationem.*

℞ *Sed libera nos a malo.*

The Fathers are also at pains to explain that prayer, like sacrifice, may be of a fourfold kind. I quote a passage from Origen, who says :<sup>1</sup>

“Let us, therefore, pray to Him (προσευχώμεθα) as to God; ask from Him (ἐντυγχάνωμεν) as from a Father; plead before Him (δεώμετα) as Lord; and give Him thanks (εὐχαριστῶμεν) as God, Father and Lord.”

Our prayer, too, should be addressed to the Father, but always through the Son. Origen likewise writes :<sup>2</sup>

“No prayer is to be addressed to the Father without the Son.”

It is interesting to note that already by the end of the third century the official liturgical day was virtually fully developed. Tertullian mentions already five times daily devoted to prayer :<sup>3</sup>

“The observation of certain hours will not be unprofitable—those common hours, I mean, which mark the intervals of the day—the third, the sixth, the ninth—which we may find in the Scriptures to have been more solemn than the rest. . . This obligation is altogether distinct from the established Prayer which must be offered, without any further insistence, at the beginning of night and day.”

De Orat., 23-25.

St. Cyprian, too, enumerates the following canonical hours as follows<sup>4</sup>: Terce, Sext and None—*sacramento scilicet*

<sup>1</sup> De Oratione, n. 16; see also Contra Celsum, nn. viii, 14 sqq.

<sup>2</sup> De Oratione, n. 15.

<sup>3</sup> De Oratione, n. 23-35.

<sup>4</sup> De Oration. Domin., n. xxxiv-xxxvi.

*Trinitatis*; the Morning Prayer, variously termed *Matutini*, *Ad Galli cantum*, *Gallicinium*, *Laudes*—*Mane orandum est ut resurrectio Domini matutina oratione celebretur*; the Prayer at Sunset, or *Vesperae*, *Lucernarium*, and possibly another Prayer when the day is over—*recedente item sole ac die cessante* (Compline?) *necessario rursus orandum est*; finally, the Night Vigils, *Vigiliae Nocturnae*, that is, our Matins—*nec noctibus ab oratione cessemus*. Only Prime, and perhaps Compline, are wanting to complete the full daily round of official prayer as fixed in future centuries. The Saint, however, takes good care to add: *Nulla hora excipitur Christianis quominus frequenter ac semper Deus debeat adorari*.

By the same date too the doctrine and practice of intercessory prayers to the Saints was definitely established. See Origen.<sup>1</sup> The poet Commodianus wrote the following quaint lines on the same subject<sup>2</sup>:

*Interea Sancti intrant in colonia sancta  
qui Dei promissa capiant sine fine laetantes:  
exorant Deum pro mortuis uti resurgant,*

There are also numerous inscriptions in the Catacombs to the same effect:

ΕΡΩΤΑ · ΥΠΕΡ · ΗΜΩΝ

*Martyres Sancti in mente habite Maria etc.*

Other minor observance of the same period can be traced back as far as the Apostolic times. For example, fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays. The Didaché is quite explicit<sup>3</sup>

“Do not keep your fastings as the hypocrites (the Jews) do: they fast on Mondays and Thursdays, you contrariwise should fast on Wednesdays and Fridays.”

The term “fasting,” however, was at that time much more comprehensive than as now understood. For one thing, it comprised almsgiving. The Shepherd writes<sup>4</sup>:

“On fasting days take nothing except bread and water, but reckon the sum that you would have spent to buy food and give it to orphans and widows.”

In a celebrated passage Tertullian lists a series of other ritual customs which he describes simply as of Apostolic tradition<sup>5</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> *In Cantica*, Lib. III; *In Numeros*, Hom. xxvi, 6; *et alibi*.

<sup>2</sup> *Carmen Apologeticum*, v. 989–991.

<sup>3</sup> I, 3; viii.

<sup>4</sup> *Simil.* V, cap. 3, 7.

<sup>5</sup> *De Corona Militis*, cap. iii.



“ We bring our oblation for the dead on their anniversary days. We deem it unlawful to fast or to kneel during prayer on Sundays, and we enjoy the same privilege from Easter to Pentecost. We are anxious lest anything from the chalice or of the bread should fall to the ground. In all our travels and movements, whether coming in or going out, in dressing or in putting on our shoes, at the bath, at the table, when lighting the candles, or lying down, whatever action we are about to perform, we mark our foreheads with the sign of the Cross.”

To conclude. We find Christian Worship, whether we consider its theological import, its essential ritual practices or even a great number of its minor rites, fully developed by the end of the third century. After social and political freedom had been granted to the Church, there was a luxuriant growth of further liturgical observance : synaxaries and sacramentaries were compiled in East and West ; the full cycle of the liturgical year was finally fixed around the three great events of Our Lord's life—His birth, His death and resurrection, His sending of the Holy Ghost—a liturgical cycle indeed, which in the light of divine revelation as well as on account of its influence on society, must be pronounced, both as to substance and as to ornament, the worthiest and most fitting means ever employed by man to worship his Maker.

DOM ROMANUS RIOS.

## THE GREEK CATHOLIC CHURCH OF OUR LADY OF DAMASCUS, VALLETTA, MALTA

THE history of the Greek Catholic community in Malta begins with the arrival of the Knights of St. John in the sixteenth century, after their withdrawal from Rhodes. A considerable number of Rhodian Catholics of the Byzantine rite seem to have followed the Knights to Malta, as in their original settlement at Birgu-Vittoriosa there were several Greek Catholic parishes. They brought with them two much venerated eikons, that of our Lady of Mercy and the great eikon of our Lady of Damascus. This last acquired the very special place which it still holds in the devotion of all Maltese at the time of the Great Siege of Vittoriosa by the Turks in 1565. It was before the eikon of our Lady of Damascus that the Grand Master Jean de la Vallette was praying at the crisis of the siege, when the ramparts were breached and the Turks seemed to be about to storm the city, and it is to our Lady's intercession that Malta has always attributed the final victory of the Christians.

When Valletta was built our Lady of Damascus was translated to the church in Strada Vescovo which bears her name. There was originally another Greek Catholic church in Valletta, that of St. Nicholas, which was transferred to the Latins in the eighteenth century and is now the church of the Holy Souls' Confraternity. The Greek papas retains certain traditional rights at St. Nicholas, and the eikon of our Lady of Damascus is now temporarily housed there. The church of our Lady of Damascus continued to be the church of the Greek Catholics of Valletta until its utter destruction by an enemy bomb in the spring of 1942. It was a flat-roofed, single-aisled sixteenth century building of small architectural merit; but it contained a very fine eikonostasis, a sanctuary furnished in all ways according to the prescriptions of the Byzantine Liturgy, and many fine eikons besides the two famous ones of our Lady. The congregation has dwindled very much in the past few generations. I am afraid there is evidence of a certain amount of deliberate latinization at some periods.

The present papas, George Skiró, has however done much during his incumbency to revitalize this ancient centre of Byzantine worship. Like his predecessors for a long time back he is an Albanian from Sicily, from the Greek Catholic centre of Piana dei Greci. He studied at the Greek College

in Rome and is most deeply imbued with zeal for the divine liturgy and love for all the holy traditions of his rite. This zeal and love he is very well able to communicate to others, and has gathered round him a band of helpers and sympathizers, clerical and lay, "Latin" as well as Greek, with whose assistance he continued to celebrate the Liturgy and Office with every possible solemnity all through the war, right up to the destruction of the church. I shall not easily forget the Easter service of 1941, celebrated that year at dawn instead of at midnight, but with Matins and Liturgy sung in full and deprived of none of their proper ceremonies, after a night of air-raids of unspeakable savagery. The last service which I attended in the church was memorable, too, with the papas chanting the Akathistos Hymn before the eikon of the Annunciation as the dive-bombers came over at sunset.

Since the destruction of his church the papas, with the sympathy and support of the Archbishop of Malta and many local clergy, has conducted a real apostolate for the Byzantine rite in Malta and Gozo. He has celebrated the Greek Liturgy in many places where it has never been seen before, given Holy Communion in both kinds to many hundreds of Latins, and trained the nuns of a famous convent school to sing at least some parts of the liturgical chant. There have been two particularly memorable occasions. The first was on the Good Friday following the destruction of the church, at a time when the mass air-raids on Malta were at their worst. The papas discovered in the ruins the *Epitaphion* (the cloth with the eikon of our Lord's burial used in the Good Friday rite of the entombment) and carried it into the great air-raid shelter near by, where he was then living, and all the people crowded to kiss and venerate it. The other was on September 8th last year, which in Malta is celebrated as the feast of our Lady of Victories in memory of the repulse of the Turks at the Great Siege of 1565. On this day the papas and the parish priest of St. Nicholas carried the eikon of our Lady of Damascus on their shoulders from St. Nicholas to the co-cathedral of St. John, the ancient church of the Knights. A great crowd gathered and followed to the cathedral, where the papas celebrated the Byzantine Liturgy before the eikon enthroned on the high altar, and gave very many communions. It was a wonderful spontaneous manifestation of devotion to our Lady in this most venerable eikon.

Not only were the church of our Lady of Damascus and the priest's house destroyed with nearly all their contents, but most of the property in Valletta on which the church (as is the Maltese custom) depended for its revenue. The eikon



of our Lady of Damascus still survives, as it was removed before the bombing. So does that of our Lady of Mercy, very badly damaged, some vestments and liturgical books and the very valuable and interesting parish registers, which go back to the beginnings of the Greek Catholic community in Malta. Everything else has gone. The papas lives for the hope of building a new church, which is to be a jewel of Byzantine art in structure and decoration, a worthy place for the celebration of the divine liturgy, enshrining our Lady of Damascus more worthily than ever before since she left Rhodes.

The Greek Catholic church of Valletta is, I suppose, the only Byzantine Catholic church in the British Empire which has been destroyed by enemy action in this war. It therefore seems that the work of rebuilding it has a special claim on the prayers and eventually the material help of lovers of the Byzantine rite in England. Papas Skiró is a reader of the *EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY* and is much interested in the work of the Society of St. John Chrysostom for the reunion of East and West, a cause for which he himself is doing a good deal both by making the Byzantine tradition of worship better understood in an intensely Latin Catholic community, and by showing the few Orthodox in Malta that it is possible for a Catholic in communion with Rome to be a true Byzantine in spirit, loving and respecting their rite. It would give him great pleasure to know that he had the support of English Catholics in his work of reconstruction.

A. H. ARMSTRONG

*Professor of Latin Literature and Classical  
Greek in the Royal University of Malta*

*Editor's Note* :—If any reader would like to help in the restoring of this church, liturgical books, eikons, etc., please communicate with A. H. Armstrong, Esq., 82 Heath-croft, Hampstead Way, London, N.W.11.

## THE MISSIONARY EXPANSION OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH<sup>1</sup>

**T**HE Orthodox Church of the East is often described as being "without missions." It is true that her missionary work is on a smaller scale than that of the Roman Catholic, Anglican or Protestant world, yet she has done, and is still doing, evangelistic work. Theologically, the Orthodox Church never forgot her missionary vocation, but her historical destiny has been unlike that of the churches of the West and in many ways much harder, and this has coloured the history of her missions.

The Byzantine Church, still in unity with Rome, though differing in forms of worship, canon law and many usages, carried the Gospel to the East. Two brothers, Cyril and Methodius, ninth century missionaries to the Slavs, are canonized as "equal to the Apostles." Not content with preaching by word of mouth, they created for these nations a script of their own and translated the Scriptures and main church services into Old Slavonic, which is still used in the churches of Russia, Serbia and Bulgaria, and was used until the seventeenth century in Rumania. Thus one of the first missionary principles was established—evangelism of new nations in their own tongue, worship in the language understood by the people, and Scripture translation into the vernacular.

With the baptism of Prince Vladimir at the end of the tenth century, Russia joined the family of Christian nations, and it is with the missionary enterprise that dates from this conversion that we are here concerned. The fact that the new faith was brought by the ruling prince created an intimate and natural relationship between the Church and the growing state, and this link, for better or worse, remained a typical feature of Russian Orthodoxy. At this early stage the Russians received their clergy from Byzantium; later, only their bishops were of Greek origin and finally the metropolitan alone, until in the year 1598 Russia grew into an independent patriarchate—in communion with all other Orthodox patriarchates.

It happened that out of all nations embracing Orthodoxy, Russia developed in a greater measure of freedom and was able to help the spread of Christianity in the East, though even in her case there was a period of some two hundred years (from 1223) when she was overrun by the Mongolians.

The missionary activities of Russia can be roughly divided into three periods: (a) the spread of Christianity mainly

<sup>1</sup> *Editor's Note* :—By courtesy of the *International Review of Missions* where it appeared October 1942. The author is an Orthodox.

through individual monks and monastic colonization in the eleventh and twelfth centuries ; (b) expansion in the east and south-east, in Siberia and Kazan, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries ; (c) after a period of stagnation, the revival of missionary work from 1830 onwards. Although we are mainly concerned here with the evangelization of non-Christian tribes and nations, it will clarify the background to note that Russia, as a "home base," once she had shaken off the Tartar yoke, became the stronghold of Orthodoxy and the main helper of all the other Orthodox peoples. The eastern patriarchs came on frequent and prolonged visits to Russia. Money was raised for their churches, and in the seventeenth and following centuries a great many Orthodox from Greece, the Slavonic countries and the East were brought up in the theological schools of Russia. By the end of the nineteenth century a Russian mission was established in Jerusalem on the initiative of the archaeologist, Bishop Porphyry Uspensky, mainly as a centre for Orthodox pilgrims and as a place of study. Russian teachers went out to the schools for Orthodox Arabs.

The early missionary work was done very quietly and the names of the first evangelists often remained unknown. It is related of one of the saints of Kiev, Theodosius (died 1074), that he used to go out of his monastery and hold disputations on matters of faith with the Jews. An early work of apologetics against the Jews is ascribed to him. But the Kiev region of Russia was more thoroughly christianized and provided with normal means of religious growth than the immense plains and woods north and east. In search of a holy life in the silence of a hermitage, isolated men went out and settled in some uninhabited place. Their life of prayer seemed to have a power of attraction. Nomads came to see them. Occasionally a few other monks would join them ; hermitages grew into communities ; villages sprang up in the neighbourhood. The peaceful monastic colonization of this period is of a wholly religious character and has nothing to do with the growth of the state. In the south, the Polovets tribes, still at warfare with Kiev, were slowly brought to Christianity, partly through the Russian women of rank married by Polovets princes, and often accompanied into their new home by some priests or monks who were enabled to preach to the heathen. In the north-west the town of Novgorod became a centre of missionary activity, chiefly among the Finns. Stephen of Perm was born in the region of Perm (which was conquered by Russia only in 1472) ; he went out in 1378, an ordained priest and a Greek scholar, to start the work of evangelization.



He made a large number of translations and reduced the barbarian language to system and writing. He preached, fought with magicians, taught young men to read and prepared them for work as teachers and priests. His method has remained one of the outstanding features of Russian missionary policy: to train new Christian leaders on terms of equality with their evangelists and foster new branches of the Church.

Among the examples of monastic missionary work should be mentioned a small foundation in the extreme north in 1429 by two hermits, Sabbati and Herman, on an island in the White Sea. From this place they were able to reach the Laplanders and other tribes along the coasts. In the sixteenth century from this Solovetski monastery, as it was called, a mission pushed up to the extreme north; thousands of converts joined the Church.

A different, but even more important, work of evangelism was meanwhile going on in the regions occupied by the Mongolians. The khans, after the first sack of towns and churches, did not show great religious intolerance. They were content with political domination and heavy taxation. Russian princes, responsible for collecting and bringing the tribute to the khans, were occasionally invited to make an act of worship of heathen deities. There were cases of martyrdom caused by refusal to bow to any but the true God. Popular memory cherished among others Michael, Prince of Chernigov, who died confessing his faith. In many cases the personal skill and tact of a prince saved him from religious conflict. Some twenty years after Russia fell under the Tartar yoke, a bishop was sent out and settled in Sarai on the Volga, the capital of the invader. The pretext, one may conjecture, was the needs of prisoners and of the officials and princes visiting their foreign rulers. But in 1276 the Bishop Mitrophan wrote to the patriarchal synod of Constantinople seeking advice concerning various religious problems, many of them of an undoubtedly missionary character.

When Kazan, the last stronghold of the Tartar kingdom, was conquered by Russia, a bishop with a group of clergy was sent out to the newly opened region. He and his workers were men of learning and piety; Bishop Guri himself and his successor German (died 1569) were afterwards canonized. One of them, who had been imprisoned by the Crimean Tartars from his youth, knew the language and customs of these Muslims. In Kazan and Astrakhan conversion and colonization of the vast new fields now opened went hand in hand. The government favoured the converts and this policy of bribery produced a great number of unsatisfactory Christians.

The missions improved again by the middle of the seventeenth century, when a new society was formed to provide for the education of the converts, most of them coming from heathenism, and a smaller number from Islam. The period after Peter the Great (1682-1725) and the short-lived reigns of women on the throne till Catherine II (1762-1796) had a sad repercussion on the work of missions. At this period, the position of the Church was changing; it was becoming more subject to the state. In the new areas the government pressed the nomad tribes to embrace Orthodoxy as a means of civilizing them and fostering their sense of citizenship. No wonder they lapsed at the first opportunity. When finally Catherine—who in this respect only followed Peter I—confiscated ecclesiastical property and sent into exile some of the higher clergy, the life of the Church was weakened, and the missionary work almost destroyed. It was to be revived in the nineteenth century.

In Siberia three groups of tribes and religions had to be met by Orthodox missionaries: the Finnish tribes, practising primitive Shamanism; the Mongolians, many of whom adopted Lamaism introduced by Kublai Khan in the early thirteenth century; and the Turco-Tartar, many of whom in the eleventh century adopted Islam. The process of colonization began at the time of Ivan the Terrible, when a group of Cossacks with Yermak penetrated deep into Siberia in 1582. The government helped to create settlements and towns. In 1620 the see of Tobolsk was founded. Emigrants were encouraged by the government; adventurous traders seeking fur descended Siberian rivers, penetrated virgin forests. During the schism produced in Russia by the liturgical reform, the "Old Believers"—opposers of the revision of ecclesiastical books—often fled into distant Siberia. Some were officially sent there. The famous fanatical and saintly archpriest Avvakum lived for a time in Tobolsk. By their presence among the primitive tribes and by their religious zeal these men acted as forerunners of the new faith. Dioceses created in Siberia were regarded as necessary for the needs of Russian settlers, and missions grew out of these centres. From them work was carried on among the Buriats and Mongols. Missionary work in Siberia continued until recent times. An Anglican bishop who visited these missions at the end of the last century,<sup>1</sup> was impressed by the Russian missions and

<sup>1</sup> N. Lyeskov has written a striking story, based on personal contact with missionaries, on life and evangelization in Siberia, entitled *On the Edge of the World*, included in *The Sentry and Other Stories*. London: Bodley Head. 1922.

interested in their methods. He conversed with the Russian missionary in Latin—the priest knowing no western modern language. There were about twelve priests working in the region, with a bishop, living in a monastery. They acted by personal contacts at home or in the monastery, not preaching in the streets. In the case of primitive races, it was considered sufficient if the clergy were satisfied with the man's reputation within his own tribe and his good character and with a small amount of instruction. If the man was able to say clearly and with understanding "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," and if he promised to keep the moral law and to put himself under further instruction from a priest, he was regarded as ready for baptism. The Russian bishop told his Anglican brother that the story of the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch was the basis for such policy, and for the real belief in the baptismal grace. It was wiser and more charitable to let grace act in the man brought into the whole fellowship of the Church and her sacraments rather than to expect him to become a perfect Christian on his own and then to baptize him as if baptism was a reward for good life.<sup>1</sup>

The expansion towards China provoked local fights and the Chinese successfully attacked some Russian centres. Amur provinces were ceded to China. Russian prisoners in Peking became instrumental in the spread of Christianity. As in the case of the Tartar areas, these prisoners needed religious ministrations, and in 1695 the Metropolitan of Tobolsk was able to equip a mission to Peking. This mission to China has a curious history. The Russian prisoners were incorporated into the imperial guard, according to the Chinese use. Among the prisoners was a priest, Maxim Leontiev (died 1712). The prisoners married Chinese ladies who embraced their religion. A Buddhist temple was transformed into a church and dedicated to St. Nicholas. The Metropolitan of Tobolsk recognized this community, sent them an antimension for the celebrations and ordered them to preach to the Chinese. These Albaginians soon lost their physical resemblance to the Russians; they were undistinguishable from other Manchus, but they remained a separate bodyguard of the imperial palace and persevered in their religion.

In 1698 the Russian embassy was sent to Peking and lodged there in a "Russian House" reserved by the Chinese government for Russian travellers and missionaries. In 1716 the house was converted into a place for ecclesiastical use and became a monastery. The monks were to occupy themselves

<sup>1</sup> See Pan-Anglican Missionary Report, 1894.



mainly with scholarly works. They translated the sacred books and used the Chinese term for the temple to explain the word for the Church, the Buddhist terms for God and "Lama" for clergy. Diplomatic relations made possible this ecclesiastical mission, with four resident priests and six students. They were studying the Chinese language as well as Manchu, and it was intended that they should return to Russia and become there a cultural link with China. The clergy were raised to the rank of mandarin and were supported by both the Russian and the Chinese government. Some great scholars came out of this mission college. It is of a type that has continued well into the present century, developing strongly in the East after the Treaty of Tientsin in 1826.

During the period 1860-1900 the New Testament was translated into Chinese, a school maintained, services celebrated in Chinese, a Russo-Chinese dictionary compiled. The evangelistic work in Peking gave noticeable results: in ten years time there were five hundred Orthodox Chinese. A school for boys and a school for girls were founded in 1870. There was a steady increase of from ten to forty adherents every year. (In North China, the Russian missionaries often used the New Testament translation and school books composed by Swann and Stallybrass of the London Missionary Society.) The Archimandrite Innocent who came out in 1897 brought about some reforms. He introduced daily celebrations in the Chinese language and some social activities. There were still some descendants of the early prisoners. These fell into poverty after the Chinese Republic was established in 1912. Some twenty-five families were in Peking and other towns. Preachers were sent to various places and parish activities were encouraged. The monastic life of Innocent did not prevent his being a good administrator, full of initiative.

The Boxer rising of 1900 affected the Russian mission as it affected other Europeans. The North City ecclesiastical establishments were destroyed; an invaluable Russo-Chinese library was burnt. Innocent was consecrated bishop in 1902, with supervision over some three hundred square miles. By his labours, a large printing press was established in Peking, a meteorological station, a steam flour-mill, a soap factory and other thriving trades. A giant in physique, he was beloved by the Chinese and known as "the grand old Bishop." In 1923 he was assisted by the newly consecrated Bishop Simon. The events of the Great War did not affect the mission, but after 1917 the theological seminary had to be closed and much of the work was interrupted. The complete disorganization

of the Church at home could not fail to make itself felt in the work in China. With the flood of exiles from Russia, the missionary monastery became a dormitory for the refugees. The link was not very close between these newcomers and the Chinese Orthodox and lay people, many of whom had lapsed. The main activities took the form of help to the refugees and the provision of schools, in which sphere Russian nuns have been invaluable.

We turn now to other fields in which missionary expansion took place in the nineteenth century following a period of stagnation.

There is an interesting outcome of the departure for North America of some of the monks from Valaam, Finland, in 1793, a venture which later developed into a regular mission. Beginning with the conversion of some groups on the Aleutian Islands, this mission coincided with the opening up of the Pacific coast of North America by the Russian-American Company (which bore the expense of the first missionaries), and with the growing impact of Russian settlers on the native life. Disaster dogged the mission's early years, but its subsequent achievements are due largely to the outstanding leadership of John Veniaminov, who was ordained priest in 1821. He laboured among the fierce Aleutians and Koloshes and like all other Russian missionaries began the work of translation of the sacred literature into their languages. It is easy to imagine the hardships of this life: endless winters, impenetrable forests, wild beasts, and the sea with all its perils. In 1839 the wife of Veniaminov died. He undertook the voyage to Petersburg to ask the support of the Synod for the mission and to discuss the possibilities of translating and publishing the Scripture in the Aleutian tongue. He was persuaded to take monastic vows and, professed in the winter of 1840 with the name Innocent (in memory of the missionary bishop of Irkutsk), he was consecrated Bishop of Kamchatka, and the Kurilian and Aleutian Islands. One of his sons later on joined him in his labours. Innocent is one of the few Russians who left some writings. The journal of his travels (*Putevoj Jurnal*) exists and one can follow him, step by step, travelling thousands of miles by sea or sledge. Innocent wrote in Aleutian and Russian. One of his Aleutian books, *Indication of the Way into the Kingdom of God*, written in 1833, was translated into Russian, and between 1839 and 1885 it came out in forty-six editions. His *Instructions*, on repentance and to those in retreat, on preparing for confession, fasting and communion, sound quite fresh to-day. He warned the zealous Orthodox

inclined to much fasting against the dangers of formalism and asceticism divorced from the deep love of God and of his neighbour. The ways to receive the Holy Ghost, he taught, are: purity of heart and chastity; humility; listening to the voice of God; prayer; daily self-negation; reading and listening to the Holy Scripture; the sacraments of the Church, and especially the Holy Communion. He deplored the fall from frequent communion and reminded people of the example of the early Christians. He saw in that sacrament not only the means of personal sanctification and an expression of the love of God, but also the remedy against disunion.

In order to facilitate access to the sacrament, he wrote to the Synod and begged them to send out several antimensions which he would pass on to his clergy for celebrations in places where there was no chapel or church. As the Holy Synod tarried, he took upon himself to distribute antimensions to missionary priests among the Tungus and informed the Synod of his action. He followed the same method in other parts of the field and, on his repeated journeys, noticed the deepening of faith in places where celebrations and communion were more frequent. Like many missionaries faced with their compatriots abroad, he was grieved by the conduct of the Russian settlers, often a scandal to the new Christians.

Innocent was raised to the rank of archbishop and finally called back to Moscow. This man of no social standing and little education ("me, the unlearned one") was given the highest office of the Russian Church: in May 1868 he became the Metropolitan of Moscow. He succeeded in this office the great light of the Russian nineteenth century, the theologian and statesman Philaret, as well as another missionary bishop, Macary of Tomsk. Innocent, lover of church singing and the beauty of worship, did more than merely enjoy them now after forty-five years of hard and lonely service. He began to think of creating schools which might produce future missionaries and spread to the newly baptized members religious art and knowledge. On his initiative was founded a school of eikon-painting, as well as a school for girls and an asylum for the aged. He fostered interest in the evangelistic work and through him, supported by the Empress and the Holy Synod, the Orthodox Missionary Society was founded in 1870. Innocent meant it to become not only the basis for work outside or on the outskirts of Russia, but also for the spread of Christianity among many nations which inhabited the country. Unfortunately, in later years this society was often connected with the reactionary policy of the government and compulsory "russification" and a great deal of money



and energy was spent in a struggle with some sects brought from the West, of Protestant origin, and with the "Old Believers."

The Atai mission in western Siberia on the borders of Chinese Turkestan, among the Tartars, Kalmycks and other non-European tribes as well as a sprinkling of Russian settlers, began in 1828 under the leadership of a remarkable man, Makari (Glukharev, 1782-1847), who had been trained in the newly created St. Petersburg Theological Academy. He and two other priests went out in conditions of great poverty, sharing absolutely everything—money, books, food, clothes—"as a means of oneness of mind." In 1839 Makari wrote *Thoughts on means of the most successful expansion of the Christian Faith among the Jews, Mohammedans and Heathens in the Russian Empire*, and he made an interesting contribution to the promotion of missionary training. He proposed to create a centre of missionary studies in Kazan in the form of a monastery training college with a programme which would include medicine, nursing and agriculture. He himself underwent a university course in natural science, anatomy and botany. While he and his fellow-missioner attended the lectures and took notes, a young woman offered to go out as a missionary. The lecture notes were passed to her, since women did not yet attend the university; Makari advised her to acquire knowledge and experience of midwifery and, realizing that she had artistic gifts as well, he also exhorted her to concentrate on icon-painting. Later she passed on this sacred art to the converts and taught in the schools. Makari's letters, which were published in 1860, reflect the inner life and striving of missionaries more than they inform readers of the actual work. To someone frightened by the difficulties of preaching in foreign dialects, Makari wrote: "It will come, do not be discouraged. Moreover, believe me, a deaf and dumb person can also praise God."

Evangelistic work among the Tartars of south-east Russia had a particularly uphill course. Its suppression by the senate in 1764 had left the field free for Muslim propaganda, the countering of which formed a major task when the Christian mission was revived in the nineteenth century. Much emphasis was laid at the time of this revival on the study of native languages, which became a special course in the seminary of Kazan and was continued by the department of missions established in 1854 until its abolition by the government in 1869—a serious blow to all missionary activity in the east.

After a struggle, missionary study was allowed, but among the optional subjects outside the main curriculum. Nevertheless, missions began to multiply. The government encouraged native education. Various "brotherhoods"—groups of clergy and laymen and women—supported these efforts. The difficult work among Muslims found an enthusiast in the person of a gifted lay scholar of the Kazan Academy, Nicholas Ilminski (died 1891). He was convinced that the slow progress of the Gospel among the Tartars was due to the use of the classical language into which both the Scripture and other works were translated. They could not follow or understand them and, surrounded by masses of Muslims, they lapsed. Ilminski studied the vernacular and various dialects used in the district and with the aid of a committee he translated the Holy Scripture and the liturgy into them. Books in popular Tartar were printed in Russian characters—thus natives were both evangelized and able to enter into the full life of the community around them. This was not a policy of russification but the desire to bring the converts into the fulness of fellowship and culture in the country of which they were citizens. At one and the same time they became literate in their own and in the Russian script. Ilminski opened schools for boys and later on schools for the native teachers. One of his Tartar helpers became a catechist and was ordained priest.

The best known and most successful mission was that to Japan. There are records in the eighteenth century of individual Japanese who embraced Orthodoxy; the language school established under Catherine II at Irkutsk had Japanese students who had been shipwrecked off the coast of Siberia, and a professor at this school in 1805 is known to have been a Japanese Orthodox. The Russian navy came across Japanese Orthodox here and there, and in 1861 a French missionary complained of "an army of popes" preaching in Japan. This, however, is an exaggeration. Even when the real mission developed there were never more than three priests at once, and from the very beginning there were Japanese ordained priests or catechists.

The mission began with the appointment of the young Father Nikolai Kasatkin (1836-1912), a graduate of Petersburg, as consular-chaplain to Hakodate in 1860. On his journey he had to stop in Irkutsk, where he came strongly under the influence of Bishop Innocent. He spent his first four years in Japan in quiet scholarship and prayer and, in addition to his duties as chaplain, in the exchange of language lessons. A sudden and dramatic incident led him to lay the foundations of Orthodoxy in Japan. Accused by a Samurai

called Sawabe of being a medium of political aggression, the calmness and intrepidity with which he faced his accuser's threats of violence so deeply impressed the latter that he became a convinced Christian and an energetic evangelistic worker even under oppression and imprisonment. Sawabe became, in fact, the first Japanese to be ordained an Orthodox priest.

With the expansion of the Church, Father Nikolai drew up a rule, striking in its simplicity and breadth of vision, which he submitted in 1870 to the Holy Synod of Russia :

The evangelists shall be organized as a deliberative body. They begin to teach others while still learning themselves. There will be meetings for those who already know Christianity—conducted by evangelists—and simpler meetings for the newly instructed ; explanation of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments. No discussions are allowed till the explanation is finished but questions should be asked. The points which are not clear should be brought for explanation before the priest and, if need be, written in a note-book. The evangelists report to the priest every Sunday and they consult together. The decisions are to be written down in note-books. Accounts, receipts and expenditure, are to be kept. The first money collected should be used for the propagation of Christianity. When sufficient money has been gathered, a young man shall be taught the Russian language and sent to a theological school in Russia. He will return and establish in Japan a school for teaching Christian doctrine and sciences. He shall also translate religious books. Another young man shall be sent to a medical school, and will found a hospital when he returns home. When there are five hundred baptized members, one of the evangelists will be sent to Russia and ordained priest. Another ordination shall take place with each additional five hundred converts. When there are five thousand believers, a bishop should be appointed for Japan.

Father Nikolai was helped in his labour by one or two Russian priests, chaplains, to the Russian legation in Tokyo. But from the very beginning, Orthodoxy in Japan was carried by the citizens of the country. At his second visit to Russia in 1879, Nikolai was consecrated bishop. In 1883 there were three foreign and eleven Japanese priests, two foreign teachers and one hundred and six Japanese evangelists. Schools were conducted by local teachers. Soon there were many churches built and an imposing cathedral in Tokyo, on a hill overlooking the whole city. Such was the popularity of the first evangelist that this cathedral itself was known under the name "Nikolai." The catholicity of the young church was stressed by Bishop Nikolai when he received for this new church an eikon with a blessing from the Archbishop of Jerusalem. He was also glad to show that a Greek archbishop visited this church and worshipped with the Japanese priests at the cathedral at Surugadai. This was important not only as a general statement of principle but in connexion with political events and the growing rivalry between Russia and Japan. When war broke out in 1904 between these two countries, Bishop Nikolai



decided not to leave Japan. He spoke to the members of his young church on their patriotic duty, and advised them to continue to pray for their country as they had done before. He himself decided to withdraw for a time from public functions "not because it might be dangerous for him personally but because as a Russian subject he could not pray that his country should be defeated." Such was the respect he enjoyed and so general was the admiration for his loyalty to both countries, that he continued to exercise a deep influence and the Church continued to grow. Many of the Japanese clergy were able to minister to the needs of the Russian prisoners of war. Those Russians raised money for the mission and both sides were greatly strengthened by this contact.

In 1906 Nikolai was raised to the rank of archbishop. It is remarkable that by this time there was only one missionary, while thirty-seven priests and one hundred and twenty-nine unordained ministers and helpers were Japanese. The unobtrusive methods of the monk prevailed. Instruction was mainly given in "utmost quiet and mental concentration, the expounder and hearers sitting in a quiet room studying the Gospel." Schools prospered. A theological seminary was established, and a large library. Most of the expenses were borne by the young Church, and there were touching instances of Japanese women making gifts for the Russian regions suffering famine during a bad year at the end of the century. Local needs were helped out of general funds—donations coming in money and rice. The Church of Russia supported, together with the Orthodox Missionary Society, the growing Church of Japan, but on a much smaller scale than other European churches or missionary societies supported their missions. It should be noticed that the relationship between Bishop Nikolai and other Christians was always of a most cordial character, and he joined with other Christian bodies in approaching the government with protests against social evils.

The Japanese Christians were impressed not only by the activities and organizing genius of Bishop Nikolai, but still more by his life of self-conquest and unrelenting industry. He returned three times to Russia during his fifty years of work, only because these visits were needed for his young church. He never took any holiday. "We cannot be poorer than Father Nikolai," they wrote (in the *Japan Evangelist*). He lived in a sparsely furnished room in a corner of the cathedral which served as office, bedroom and dining-room.

His day strikes one by its discipline. From half past seven till noon, all the year round, he worked on the translation of the New Testament, of prayer books and of other religious

literature, often with the co-operation of his helpers. After a plain lunch and a rest, from two till six he attended to the business of the diocese. Three more hours of translation work and study closed his day. Like most of the Russians, the bishop loved good singing in the church. A choir of the converts, of several hundred voices, has been trained to sing in harmony.

At the World Missionary Conference, Edinburgh, 1910, the name of Bishop Nikolai was mentioned by many, and he sent a cordial greeting, pointing out, however, that "we are not one because we disagree in doctrine."

Since his death events have not made the life of Orthodoxy in Japan any easier: the Great War, the revolution in Russia, war in the Far East. The number of Japanese Christians seems to have fallen (they were said to be 30,000 by 1912, but in 1939 the *Japan Christian Year Book* reports as "present members 13,503, grand total 41,251). There are 184 churches, 34 priests, 38 evangelists; Sunday School attendance approaching six hundred. The new bishop, Sergius, tried to revive the theological seminary, but it has had finally to be closed for the time being. But the life of the Church is going on. Literature has been produced recently such as *An outline of the doctrine and the Creed of the Church*, a *Revised Prayer Book*, as well as books for Sunday Schools, instructions to teachers, hymnals. It is also proposed to print a children's New Testament in colloquial language.

In July 1940 the Synod of the Orthodox Church in Japan decided to become independent of Moscow. Bishop Sergius resigned and a Japanese is now the head of the autocephalous Japanese Orthodox Church. Its decision not to become a member of the newly constituted Church of Christ in Japan, and the fact that it has not yet received government recognition as an independent body, place it in a somewhat uncertain position. It seems likely, however, that the effects of the removal of foreign missionaries from positions of executive authority in every branch of the Christian Church in Japan, which has been a leading requirement in the overcoming of the crisis through which all have passed, will be minimized in Japanese Orthodoxy, where indigenous leadership has been so strongly marked from the very beginning.

NADEJDA GORODETZKY.

## NEWS AND COMMENTS

Since our last issue the most outstanding event that has happened is the death of Cardinal Hinsley. Our readers will have already seen notices and appreciations of his Eminence in the current press both Catholic and secular, yet, although these words will come as an aftermath to what has already been said, gratitude and a deep appreciation for all the Cardinal did for the cause we have at heart prompt us to speak.

First then, to set on record Cardinal Hinsley's appreciation of the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY. In reply to our sending him a copy (we have always made a custom of sending a copy of each number to Archbishop's House, Westminster), he wrote: "As far as in me lies I will do whatever I can to show my sympathy and encouragement in your work." But apart from this personal debt of thanks, we must express our appreciation of all that his Eminence has done for the general cause of Christian unity. Here we do not think it too much to say that he is the first English Catholic bishop to have really placed this great cause on the map of practical politics. And he has been able to do this partly because of the war and the way he captured the public imagination and sympathy by his fearless leadership, but even more because he took a long view of the whole problem, basing all his work of Christian co-operation on the foundation of the natural law, thus both respecting the different religious beliefs of other Christian bodies and yet being able to stand with other Christian leaders on the same common platform. Thus he has prepared the ground for all workers in the more distant fields of Christian unity. In closing this short appreciation we would like to stress a point made in *The Month* (March-April, 1943), that Cardinal Hinsley combined truly English qualities with all that go to make up a "Roman" in the ecclesiastical use of that word. He had been a student in Rome when Leo XIII issued the "Rerum Novarum" to the world, a student indeed of the English College and this a part of the Gregorian University. He was ordained priest there in 1893 and became rector of the same college in 1917. It was Pope Pius XI who nominated him a titular bishop in 1926 and two years later the same pope named him Apostolic Visitor to Africa. So that when in 1937 he was raised to the sacred college he could truly be said to be a "Roman" cardinal. Hence it was to be expected that he would view Christian co-operation as a practical Englishman and also with the large mind of Rome, basing it as does the present Holy



Father on the natural law and on the common Christian basis of *belief in one God and the love of one Christ*.

At his requiem in Westminster Cathedral were present Archbishop Germanos, the Exarch of the Patriarch of Constantinople in Western and Central Europe, and representatives of the Anglican Church, the Bishops of Gloucester and Chichester, and the Deans of Westminster and St. Paul's. So did the other Christian bodies join with their Catholic brethren in praying for and doing him honour. R.I.P.

We call the attention of our readers to Mr. Christopher Dawson's most recent book, *The Judgement of the Nations* (we will review it in our next issue). It puts the great work for Christian unity in its right setting in the new world.

We would also call attention to Mr. Serge Bolshakoff's article on "Russian Religious Thought" in *The Month* (January-February, 1943). It is a very complete summary of events and the religious mental trend of Russians from their early days of Christianity to the present day.

We will now record a few news items.

#### RUMANIA

The Orthodox Patriarch Nicodemus resigned his office at the end of October 1942. The central question is what is to be the attitude of the Rumanian Church to the Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow? (See *The Tablet*, November 21st, 1942).

#### NEW YORK

The Catholic chapel of St. Michael, for Russians of the Byzantine rite, on Mulberry Street, still carries on, though it has lost a number of members to the armed services. Among the regular congregation are three people of Greek origin, formerly dissident Orthodox, and three converts from Judaism. The priest-in-charge, Father Andrew Rogosh, recently celebrated the Holy Liturgy at the Benedictine priory at Portsmouth, R.I., the monks providing a choir, coached by Brother Robert Cutler, formerly of St. Michael's.

#### CHICAGO

In our last issue we announced the appointment of the Hieromonk Ambrose Senshyn as auxiliary bishop to Mgr. Constantine Bohachevsky, exarch for the Galician Ukrainians in U.S.A. He was duly ordained bishop in the Basilian church of St. Nicholas at Chicago on October 22nd, 1942 (O.S., October 9th, St. James the Less), by Mgr. Constantine.

The co-consecrators were Mgr. Basil Takach, exarch for the Podcarpathian Ukrainians in U.S.A., and Mgr. Vladimir Ladyka, exarch for the Ukrainians of Canada. This was the first episcopal consecration in the Byzantine rite ever to take place in U.S.A., and there was a large congregation, including 300 clergy; the Archbishop of Chicago and twelve other bishops of the Latin rite were present. The rite of consecration used by the Ukrainians differs only in small details from the typical form in the Byzantine *Eukhologion* published in Rome in 1873; the most notable modification is a long addition to the already long and historically interesting profession of faith pronounced by the bishop elect.

An auxiliary bishop has also been appointed for the Ukrainian exarch in Canada, Mgr. Ladyka, in the person of Father Nicholas Savaryn.

### QUEBEC

Father Joseph Ledit, S.J., formerly professor at the Oriental Institute in Rome, is giving a course of lectures on Eastern theology at Laval University. Last year he gave a course on Eastern ecclesiastical history, and hopes to follow these with courses on Eastern worship and canon law, the whole to be eventually published as a text-book, *De Ecclesiis Orientalibus*.

### POLAND

The Polish Research Centre in London has published an account of the history of the Orthodox Church in Poland and Polish-ruled lands from the earliest times (32 Chesham Place, S.W.1., 1s.). The subject is one of great delicacy that requires careful handling, and the anonymous author seems to have made a genuine effort to write objectively and impartially, but has not always been completely successful. This historical sketch provides one more illustration of the horrible and deep-rooted harm that has been done to Christianity by the use, by both laymen and ecclesiastics, of churches as instruments in political, national, racial and cultural interests, and *vice versa*.

In view of the known difficulties of Orthodoxy in Poland, the census figures of 1931 are of special interest. The total of three and three quarter million Orthodox was made up, in round numbers, of one and a half million Ukrainians, 900,000 White Russians, 696,000 "Polesians," 497,000 Poles, 100,000 Great Russians, and 21,000 Czechs. Of these, only the "Polesians" have "little or no national consciousness, take no sides in politics, and remain indifferent to all nationalistic and religious disputes."

## WESTERN UKRAINE

No contemporary bishop has suffered more in seeing years and years of devoted work for his flock ruined by war and invasion than Mgr. Andrew Szepticky, Archbishop of Lwow, primate of the Catholic Ukrainians in Poland. Nor have these trials done anything to modify his courageous zeal for Christian unity. It is reported that at the end of 1941 he addressed an appeal to all bishops of Ukrainian sees in the Orthodox Church urging them to reconciliation with Rome, on both religious and national grounds. This was followed by a similar appeal addressed to Ukrainian lay leaders of thought. In the course of his second letter Mgr. Andrew declared that he would gladly recognize the primatial jurisdiction of any future metropolitan of Kiev who should be in communion with the Holy See; he thus made his own the attitude of the Catholic Melkite patriarch, Mgr. Cyril Mogabgab, who some years ago made a similar declaration with reference to the Orthodox patriarch of Antioch. It appears that Mgr. Andrew's appeals caused great interest among the Orthodox concerned; but the situation is riddled with nationalistic jealousies and political intrigue of the grossest kind, and it is very doubtful if any corporate reunion in these parts in the near future would be any more satisfactory than were Lyons and Florence on a larger scale.

## OCCUPIED RUSSIA

In *The Commonweal* (New York) of February 19th, Miss Helen Isvolsky discusses a report on conditions in nazi-occupied Russia drawn up by Mr. A. Ladyensky, president of the Russian Christian Labour Movement in Geneva. The report was published in France in the autumn of 1942, and reprinted in America by the New York newspaper *Rossya*. Mr. Ladyensky confirms that in the Ukraine the Germans recognize both the rival Orthodox churches, Ukrainian and Great Russian. The appointment of bishops has to be ratified by the German administration, and land confiscated from churches by the Soviet government is not to be returned to its ecclesiastical owners. Mr. Ladyensky, without expressing an opinion on their accuracy, reports rumours that Catholic priests of both Latin and Eastern rites have been brought into occupied Russia by the nazis. Similar statements have been made for some time from various sources. Miss Isvolsky comments that, if it be true that Catholic missionaries are sponsored by the nazis, it "is enough to breed the worst kind of hostility and distrust. German interference can only discredit



the Eastern Catholic rite in Russia for many years to come. It is the deplorable historical truth that Catholic missionaries too often have come to Russia with an invader."

#### ALEXANDRIA

The patriarchal newspaper *Pantainos*, of February 11th, gives the following news:

"On Monday, February 8th, the Patriarch called together all the clergy of Alexandria and a considerable number of the members of the Church, distinguished for their piety, and informed them of his desire to build in the Western Desert, somewhere near the shrine of St. Mina of Egypt, a church and a fairly large monastery near it. The monastery, said the Patriarch, will have monks, and later on, when the needs of the Church require it, there will be a school there for the training of theologians and clergy, capable of helping to establish missionary stations throughout the whole of Africa. At the same time, said His Beatitude, there will be a chapel alongside the monastery, in which will be inscribed in letters of gold the names of the children of the Orthodox Church who fell in the Western Desert. On another side to the chapel there will be carved a chronological list of the battles fought there with a short note on these battles. As is well known the pretext and reason for founding this chapel are derived from the fact that it was in the Western Desert and near to the shrine of St. Mina, that the German-Italian armies, which seriously threatened Egypt, were defeated.

"Together with his Beatitude, the Greek Orthodox world, and also many of those who fought but were not Orthodox, believed that the grace of St. Mina of Egypt more than anything else contributed to the defeat and shameful flight of the enemy. A committee was appointed on the spot to collect funds under the presidency of the Patriarch. The collection will be extended later beyond Alexandria throughout all Egypt."

In this connection the Patriarch issued the following encyclical, which was published in the same issue of *Pantainos*:

"Christopher, by the mercy of God, Pope and Patriarch of Alexandria and all Egypt.

"To the whole Body of the Church, Blessing from God.

"Our Church, being firmly convinced that Egypt, which was threatened some months ago by an invasion of the German-Italian armies, was delivered by the prayers to God of the holy and glorious great martyr Mina, the miracle worker of Egypt, whose ruined church and tomb is near Alamain, where the historical defeat of the barbarians by the 8th Army

in co-operation with the 1st Brigade of the Greek Army took place; and desiring to perpetuate and connect this event with some memorial to our nation and Church, which should proclaim through the ages the piety, the heroism and the sense of honour of the Greek Orthodox, has decided first of all and principally to restore the church of St. Mina on the site of the ancient church which the Byzantine Emperor Arcadius built and made a shrine for all Christian people, and secondly to build a chapel with a memorial tablet, on which shall be inscribed in indelible letters of gold, the honoured names of those who fell for faith, fatherland, (ustice and freedom.

“To attain this sacred and national object—after conferring with chosen and zealous children of the Church, both of the clergy and laity—we have set up a central finance committee under our presidency, and a special committee to proceed systematically to collect funds—at present in Alexandria and the suburbs. We therefore call upon the whole body of the Church to show their well-known feelings of generosity for the Church and Nation, so that this great and historical work may be completed in the most magnificent and dignified manner.

“May the Lord our God at the prayers of the glorious, great martyr St. Mina, the miracle worker of Egypt, increase the fruit of your piety and your righteous gifts to the glory of His adorable Name. Amen.

In Alexandria. February 11th, 1943.

✠ Christopher of Alexandria.”

(Quoted in *Orthodox Church Bulletin*, April 1943).

#### FROM THE BYZANTINE LITURGY.

“Hail, gate of the Lord, impassable.

Hail, bulwark and shelter of those that flee unto thee.

Hail, untroubled haven, and pure from marital intercourse.

Thou that didst bring forth in flesh thy maker and God,  
cease not to intercede for those who hymn and adore  
thy bringing forth.”

(*Theotokion* for Easter).

“When the Highest, descending, confounded the tongues,  
he divided the nations :

When he distributed the tongues of fire, he called all to  
unity; and with one accord we glorify the All-Holy  
Spirit.”

(*Kontakion* of Pentecost).

## OBITUARY

MR. H. W. CODRINGTON.

Humphrey William Codrington, elder son of Rear-Admiral William Codrington C.B., and the Hon. Mrs. Codrington, was born in 1879, and was educated at Winchester and New College, Oxford. He left Winchester in 1896 in order to join the Catholic Church. In 1903 he entered the Ceylon Civil Service, in which he served for nearly thirty years, holding many important posts in Ceylon. In 1919 he married Joyce, third daughter of the late Rev. W. H. Bleadon, Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene, Paddington. He died in London on November 7th, 1942, leaving a widow, two sons and a daughter. He had retired from the Ceylon Civil Service in 1932, and was living in London, where on the outbreak of war he became an air warden and fulfilled the trying duties of that office during the worst period of the air attacks on the capital.

Mr. Codrington was by taste and natural gifts a student and scholar, whose death, while still in the prime of his powers, will be felt as a serious loss to English and Catholic learning. At an early age his interests were turned to the Eastern Churches, and especially their liturgies. Before his departure for Ceylon he had acquired a sound knowledge of Syriac and Arabic, and he had transcribed at the British Museum a number of early unprinted documents bearing on the history of the Jacobite or Syrian Monophysite rites. Not long after his departure he put these transcripts in the hands of Dom Hugh Connolly of Downside, with the freest permission to make use of them as he thought best; and eventually they were edited with translations in a volume of the Text and Translation Society's publications (1913), the book appearing under their joint names with the title *Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy*, etc. Having a natural gift for languages, Mr. Codrington soon mastered the native dialects of Ceylon and threw himself into the study of the history and antiquities of the island, and he later produced the learned dissertation *Ceylon Coins and Currency* (Colombo, 1924), which remains the standard work on that subject. Later still, after his return to England, he published a companion work, *Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon* (Colombo, 1938); he also wrote *A Short History of Ceylon* (Macmillan and Co., London, 1926). On his return in 1932 he resumed his earlier liturgical interests, and undertook for the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, Rome, the production of a new and critical edition of the Syriac Liturgies. This laborious work was cut short by his



death, but he had already brought out *Anaphora Syriaca Severi Antiocheni* and *Anaphora Syriaca Ioannis Chrysostomi*. A work of more special interest was his scholarly edition of *The Liturgy of St. Peter* (Münster in Westfalen, 1936), in the series of liturgical publications under the direction of the Benedictines of Maria Laach. The particular interest of this liturgy, previously but little understood, is that it is a Greek translation of the western Mass set in a Byzantine framework, and is found in manuscripts as early as the tenth or eleventh century. In Mr. Codrington's opinion it was "based upon a Latin text in use among the Lombards of South, probably South-Central Italy," and "its primitive form almost certainly was that of an inter-linear gloss on a Latin Missa quotidiana cum Canone . . . made for the use of Greek-speaking priests who celebrated in Latin." He also wrote many articles for *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, and contributed to the *Journal of Theological Studies*, the *Revue Bénédictine*, the *Downside Review*, and THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY.

Mr. Codrington was not only a man of wide learning, but a scholar in the strict sense of the term, with a fine critical sense, a thorough knowledge of the way in which texts should be edited, and a sound judgement in the interpretation of evidence. Yet there was never anyone on whom such attainments sat more lightly; for he refused to recognize himself as anything but an amateur, and with extraordinary modesty he constantly sought the opinions of others who were certainly far less qualified than himself to pass a judgement on the questions he would propose. The writer of the present very inadequate record can testify to the truth of this statement. All who have had the privilege of knowing him will wish to join in offering their sincere condolences to his family.

R. HUGH CONNOLLY, O.S.B.

#### THE REV. SPENCER JONES.

The Rev. Spencer Jones was, with Father Paul Francis of the Society of the Atonement, the founder of the Church Unity Octave. We can best give some words of appreciation of this Anglican papalist leader by quoting from Father Vincent MacNabb, O.P., in *The Pilot* (May, 1943): "To-day I have just heard of the loss we have met by the death of my old friend, the Rev. Spencer Jones." He then goes on to speak of his witness and as exemplified by the way he was passed over in the road to "clerical preferment" on account of his book *England and the Holy See*. He concludes: "But the

thought and the reasoned thesis of his books have been a power which we ill gauge by the arithmetic of circulation. Though not alone, it was dominant in creating a movement which, after giving us the Malines Conversations, is now giving us a greater than the Malines Conversations in the mutual talks and joint action of our religious leaders.

“But the thesis of *England and the Holy See* was the thought of a deep thinker and a humble soul. It quietly affirmed that all the legal acts responsible for the present separation between England and what the historians would call the Mother Church of Rome, were not legal and official acts of the Church of England, but only of the English Crown. That affirmation, so fateful for the future of Christendom, may one day become the legal question of the century; and in that day Spencer Jones may be seen, not only as somewhat of a martyr (i.e. one who witnesses), but as somewhat of a prophet.” R.I.P.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

### RUSSIAN RELIGION AND CULTURE

*Outlines of Russian Culture.* By Paul Miliukov. Edited by Michael Karpovich. Translated by Valentine Ughet and Eleanor Davis. Three volumes. i: *Religion and Church*, pp. 220. \$2.50. ii: *Literature*. pp. 130. \$1.50. iii: *Architecture, Painting and Music*. pp. 159. \$2. (University of Pennsylvania Press, U.S.A. 1942).

Paul Miliukov's *Ocherki Po Istorii Russkoi Kultury*, as yet unfinished, is for the most part familiar to Russian students. Its learned author, now eighty-two years of age, was an outspoken opponent of the tsarist régime, and when that régime was overthrown he came into prominence in Russia. With the establishment of the communist government, however, he had to leave and went to France, where he wrote this book, of which only part had been published at the outbreak of the second world-war. The second *Outlines* is not a translation of all the published parts of the original volume II; and one of the most interesting sections, that on education, is missing.

War-time expediency compels many publishers to bring out books on Russia which are written, not from a communistic or irreligious point of view, but about a Russia where religion is said to be free. It is a fact emphasized by Dr. Adolph Keller in his *Christian Europe To-day* that there is a dangerous tendency (born of political expediency) in this new literature to deny, or at any rate to minimize, the persecution and suppression of religion and the hampering of education, which obtains in Russia even at the present. No one has loved Russia more in recent times than the late Pope Pius XI and he believed that communism is a worse enemy of the Church than nazism.<sup>1</sup> We must treat therefore these war-time publications with reserve. They are often written with superficial brilliance by writers who cloak their lack of historical knowledge, of general education even, with a facile use of words. Moreover, this second world war clearly shows that scientific objectivity is not to be found in the extremes which go hand-in-hand with war and propaganda. Certain tendencies creep into historical record, and we in our democracies feel (just as do our opponents) the influence of the political tendency of

<sup>1</sup>It must not be overlooked, however, that Pius XI also condemned nazism (e.g., in *Mit brennende Sorge*), and that he died before the worst results of nazi doctrine and practice were made clear to the world. In either case he was condemning that ancient idolatry, the worship of the state.—EDITOR.



the day on our scientific research and publications. For this reason the translation of Miliukov's book is specially welcome.

The time, the event and the issue are not important in themselves ; it is the interaction of all three which constitutes culture. It is this method of historical record—of which a perfect example is *El punto de vista en las Artes*, by the Spanish philosopher, José Ortega y Gasset—which has been followed (probably unintentionally) by Miliukov in these three volumes. They are not reference books, as the titles might suggest, but elaborated historical compositions of a personal character. And as such they give us far more than history alone ; they give us an insight into Russian culture which is essential if we are to understand life in Russia to-day. This understanding draws an added importance from the part which Russia will undoubtedly play in the forthcoming peace conference, a part proportionate to her gigantic war effort which in itself is a consequence and result of that little-known Russian culture in which communism is only an episode.

Russia is not only a mighty ally in this war ; she has held an important position in European history for over a thousand years. But until after the first world-war she was to most Europeans, and to even more Americans, a remote, dark and primitive country. Then she became a "menace to the world," and her history and culture were more than ever neglected. Religious leaders would speak of her "fossilized religion," until prominent Protestant leaders at the Upsala conference saw that the contrary was the truth ; that is, until the Russian Theological Institute in Paris started its work. Probably after this war the greatest work accomplished by Pius XI will prove to have been the foundation of the Russicum in Rome where, during the communist "anti-God" campaign and while people questioned the pope's optimism, priests for Russia were trained. But such centres for the study of Russian culture were isolated places. Now this book (which, fortunately, is not published by a ministry of information or by the Soviet embassy) is a fairly impartial work on Russian culture as seen by a scholar of Russian birth with his own individual outlook, whose name guarantees the contents. It is one of very few books on this topic in the English language : in itself a proof of neglect of things Russian.

The material foundations of Russian culture were dealt with in the first volume of the Russian edition of the work, published in Paris ; but, since that volume is still unfinished, it has not been translated. Consequently, it is often difficult to follow the author in his second volume—the one in English in three parts and with which we are dealing—since in writing

it he assumes that the first volume has been read. Nevertheless, each of the three volumes is more or less complete in itself and can be read (and bought) separately as a specialist's study on a certain subject.

Throughout Miliukov stresses the influence exerted by Constantinople on the development of Russia. This influence may be traced especially in the first and third parts, which deal with religion and the arts. The author's conclusion is that Russia has indeed "never outlived her Byzantine origins." In religion, the strength of Byzantine influence dates from the baptism of St. Vladimir, and the author maintains that at their mass conversion the Russians imbibed more of Byzantine formalism and ritualism than of the true Christian spirit; indeed he attributes to this Byzantine formalism Russia's "backwardness" in politics, economics and "technics." Miliukov calls the ever-glorious City of Constantine "corrupted Byzantium," and "from this poisoned source Russia adopted the great Christian conception whose vital force was severed at its root by Byzantine formalism." As early as on page 2 he fulminates, "Actually the influence of the Byzantine church on Russian culture was great, but it was a destructive influence," and argues that as a consequence of this devotion to dogmatism and ritual the revolution could take the Russian Church unaware; she had always been a tool of the state and did not know how to deal with bolshevism.

One may or may not agree with the author on these and other matters. But it would appear that Miliukov is not at his strongest when dealing with the interaction of ecclesiastical development and secular history: and the interaction of historical events with tendencies in religion or ecclesiastical life is very strong indeed. This can be well appreciated to-day since there is plenty of evidence of it around us.

It is always difficult to be objective in war-time. Miliukov furnishes an example from the sixteenth century when the tsar fought against the Poles and at his command (to-day we should say "at his suggestion" or even "spontaneously") the Russian Orthodox hierarchy rejected the famous "renovations of Kiev." Yet a century later they were accepted, for the tide of war had turned and the Ukraine was being conquered and assimilated. In time of peace this is called lack of historical critical sense; in war-time it is called political prudence.

Miliukov, perhaps better than any other writer available in English, describes the nationalization of faith and church in Russia as the origin of the "schism," when towards the end of the sixteenth century the Russian Church became national in substance and form by the establishment of a

patriarchate and the close union between church and state. This conclusion is all the more interesting to-day, when it appears that governments tend more than ever to use the Church for their own purposes. But for Miliukov it is again a case of "the formalism of the old Russian religion which is the cardinal trait characterizing both the schism and the national church." And it is again formalism, as a survival of the Russian paganism of bygone days, which led to the formation of the sects, whether those "with priests" or without. No book in a western language treats so thoroughly of the origin, and still more of the spiritual background, of such sects and of the Shoredwellers, Theodosians, Molokans, Dukhobors, Khlysty, Skoptsy and others. The influence of different Protestant movements on Russian religious life are dealt with in a way which takes due account of the mentality of the Russian people as well as of the sects concerned. But why is the author so bitter on this subject?

The chapter on religion and church during the revolution and the following years is most interesting. Some good books are already available in English on this subject: e.g., Fedotov's *The Russian Church since the Revolution*; see also N. S. Timashev's *Religion in Soviet-Russia* in an issue of *Thought* (New York) during 1940.<sup>1</sup>

The exposition of Russian mentality and temperament is rather inadequate, but there is an excellent chapter on it in the volume on literature. This shows that the three books, though each can stand alone, should all be read to gain a complete picture of Russian culture. Volume II has this advantage, that Russian literature is more widely known and of greater general interest than either Russian religion or her other arts. Most of the Russian classics and the works of many contemporary writers are available in English and other western languages, and Miliukov expects of his readers an uncommonly wide knowledge of Russian literature. But he provides a survey, and a good one, of that literature from the very beginning, when books were written under the influence of legends of the saints, of which A. Brückner has published an admirable collection in German. Thus this chapter, and indeed the third volume, on the arts, as well, forms an excellent supplement to the volume on religion. After a very good introductory article—probably the best yet published on

<sup>1</sup>Timashev has recently published a book entitled *Religion in Soviet-Russia* (Sheed and Ward). The writer has not yet had an opportunity of seeing it (living as he does on a remote West Indian island) and so is unable to say whether it is a reprint of the article in *Thought* or an elaboration of it.



the subject—on the secularization of Russian literature, the author passes on to a treatment of the classical period, but he neglects to deal adequately with the spiritual background which produced the Russian classics. As in the first volume, he takes too little account of events and movements in Western Europe, and of the interaction of the subject in hand with social history.

The volume on architecture, painting and music is a concise survey but needs illustrations: natural history cannot be properly studied if one has never seen a tree or a chicken, and this third volume suffers accordingly.

The editor, Professor Michael Karpovich of Harvard, has written a postscript to each of the three books covering the period up to about the outbreak of the second world-war, and, whatever its defects, the whole work is a remarkable war-time production. It represents thought which is the outcome of a life-time's study and as such is not comparable with the journalistic accounts of subjects by people who have never thought at all (and who never will think, otherwise they could not earn their living) with an encyclopaedia as source book. We can only hope that the author, who is already eighty-two years old, may live long enough to give to the world the rest of his projected book.

JOHN HARTOG.

*Light Before Dusk.* A Russian Catholic in France, 1923—41. By H. Iswolsky. (Longmans Green.) 15s.

This book gives an interesting inside picture of the French Catholic social movement during the years of *l'entre deux guerres*, and also of the Russian emigré community in Paris and its contacts with Catholicism. Neither subject is of a merely French interest: the work of Maritain and that of Berdyaev are equally of European and world-wide significance, but a great deal of light is thrown on the particular problem of France during a period of remarkable and not finally to be frustrated promise.

In connection with both the social and "reunion" movements it is particularly interesting to note the part played by religious houses, especially the great Benedictine abbeys of Dourgne and En Calcat, which have been powerhouses of spiritual and intellectual enlightenment and strength for the French intelligentsia, while other communities have played a more active rôle, the wonderful Dominican centre of La Tour Maubourg being particularly described here.

The contribution of French Catholic thinkers on social questions has been most impressive, and their active movements

are among the best in the world. But on this side the book is also of interest because it unconsciously illustrates some profound deficiencies in the outlook of the "intellectuals." There is no evidence of any comprehension of the point of view of those (probably including the vast majority of Catholics, clerical and lay) who are dismissed as "*bien pensants*," "bourgeois," "reactionaries," nor of that of the champions of Christian society in Austria, Spain and Italy. In both cases there is some ground for, for instance, Maritain's criticisms, but it is only obscured by an intransigent idealist comprehension of practical problems and necessities. The pathetic fallacy of the infallible eye-witness deludes all this group in the case of the Guernica bombing, and even the breach with Claudel does not shake their complacency. The same weaknesses have more recently been manifest in much of their criticism (from America and England) of the Vichy régime. The cult of "youth" (of immaturity and inexperience) is also prominent. "Non-conformism" and "liberalism" are qualities highly esteemed.

With regard to Russia two distinct problems are discussed, that of the Russian Church and that of the Revolution. We can wholly sympathize with Mlle. Iswolsky's view with regard to the former that understanding must be cultivated, and, not differences, but "the common historical and mystical stem with its roots in the earliest ages of Christianity" of the Eastern and Western Churches must be emphasized. Particularly interesting, too, is the evidence she gives of the popularity of St. Teresa of Lisieux among the Orthodox, which shows that even the most modern manifestations of Western Catholicism are not necessarily repugnant to Easterns. The importance of Solovyev is also rightly emphasised. With regard to the Revolution, Mlle. Iswolsky speaks highly of the spiritual resistance of the Russian people to communism and atheism, and it is much to be hoped that this view is not unduly optimistic. It is a little difficult to see what is the special significance of the acceptance by the "Post-Revolutionaries" of the Revolution "as an accomplished fact, as a landmark in Russian history." It is to be hoped that it is not one more attempt to graft figs on thistles.

This is a book of great interest for all those who are concerned with the great problems of the reunion of Christendom and the healing of the diseased social order which is one of the most palpable fruits of the sixteenth-century revolt against the unity of the Church.

DOM THEODORE RICHARDSON.

*A Hand List of Illuminated Oriental Christian Manuscripts.*  
By Hugo Buchthal and Otto Kurz. Pp. 120. (London,  
1942: The Warburg Institute.)

"The present hand list is intended as an index and bibliography to the existing literature, which it is difficult to survey." Thus is the book described in the preface. The MSS concern what are often styled the lesser Eastern churches, viz., Syrian, Coptic, Ethiopic and Armenian, and this is the order in which they are listed, with the addition of some Arabic MSS. (B).

Again we are told that since the chief interest of these groups of miniatures consists in their possible influence on art of the Byzantine Empire or of the Byzantine art on them, only manuscripts up to the fifteenth century are listed, for after that century, except in the case of Armenian book illustrations, the main stream of Byzantine art ceased.

One object of this bibliographical study is to help research in the early influences of Byzantine art. This is usually described as a mixture of late Hellenism and oriental influences from Christian Syria, Armenia or Egypt.

It is interesting to note how many of these illuminated MSS. are to be found in England—of Syrian MSS., 28 in the British Museum, London, and one in the Chester Beatty Collection, and four in Oxford. Two Arabic MSS. are in London (British Museum); of Coptic, one in Birmingham, eight in Manchester, 32 in the British Museum, five in the Victoria and Albert Museum, and three in the Chester Beatty Collection, London, and fourteen at Oxford.

There is one Nubian and ten Ethiopic at the British Museum, London. Of Armenian, sixteen in the British Museum, thirteen at Oxford, two in Manchester and one at Cambridge.

The one illustration is the frontispiece taken from the Paris collection of Coptic MSS.

A most valuable and helpful work.

K.F.E.W.

*Serbian Church Life.* By R. M. French. Pp. 64. (London, S.P.C.K.) 3s. 6d.

This is a welcome addition to those books which describe Orthodox church life. This particular account gives this life in a Serbian setting, hence its special value.

It is important for all students of Orthodoxy to realize that although there is a unity of faith and even, unlike Catholicism, a certain uniformity in worship and canon law (e.g., the all but universal use of the Byzantine liturgy and a married parochial clergy), there is a great difference between the varying local



and national traditions. So with the general picture of Orthodox church life, which we constantly need, the local Serb manifestation is here presented to us. And this at a time in which the public needs to know something more of Yugoslavia. There are fifteen good illustrations.

B.W.

*The History of the Primitive Church.* By Jules Lebreton S.J., and Jacques Zeiller. Translated from the French by Ernest C. Messenger Ph.D. Vol. I. (London, Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd.) 16s.

No presentation of early Christianity can be deemed satisfactory which does not throw into clear relief the events of the New Testament. Acting on this principle, the authors of the present work have begun their task with a careful and painstaking study of the life of Christ, followed by a no less thorough treatment of the Apostolic age as depicted by the inspired writers. In particular, the significance of the environment in which our Lord lived and taught is well brought out, and the main episodes of His ministry are presented in an attractive setting. Copious notes and documentation show the authors' familiarity with the results of modern research, while controverted questions are treated with insight and restraint.

In one case, however, the writers appear to have overlooked the latest evidence, viz., on the question of the Jewish parties. It is now recognized that the Pharisees were not a religious sect, but a political party, as were also their rivals the Sadducees. The main question which divided these parties was: to which of them did civil authority lawfully belong? The Sadducees claimed this authority for themselves, as representing the priestly power, and so they looked forward to a "Restorer" who should be of the priestly line and of the tribe of Levi. The Pharisees, on the contrary, sought to wrest the civil power from the priests and keep it in their own hands, alleging that the Messiah was to come from the lay tribe of Judah, and from the house of David. The purely *religious* differences between the parties were negligible. Josephus, himself a Pharisee, is unreliable here: for he is obviously interested in exaggerating differences, in order to strengthen his case against the priesthood. The Sadducees are best studied in connection with the Samaritans, who, in many respects, were their prototypes. For the Samaritans, it is now known, were not foreigners: they were properly Jews, and the oldest dissenting Jewish sect. Like the Sadducees, they claimed

that civil authority belonged of right to the priestly caste, of which they considered themselves the only lawful representatives. In the present volume, unfortunately, the Samaritans are hardly mentioned. A little further discrimination on these points would have been more in harmony with the high standard of scholarship reflected in other parts of the work. Our thanks are due to the translator for providing us with a very readable version of a valuable study.

DOM ANTHONY FLANNERY.

*The Evangelical Revival and Christian Reunion.* By Archibald W. Harrison. Pp. 207. (London: The Epworth Press.) 8s. 6d.

This is a fascinating book and well documented. It throws a great deal of light on Christianity in England in the eighteenth century and should be read by all those who wish to understand the problem of Christianity in this country or in the U.S.A.

Various facts stand out in the growth of the Revival which it is good for us to remember. The first is that it was a revival *within* the Church of England; it may even be called an "Oxford Movement," though it preceded *the* Oxford Movement by almost a century; the two Wesleys and the other members of the Holy Club were all Oxford men. It should also be noted that the first members of the Holy Club were often represented as high-church ritualists. Every Wednesday and Friday they fasted, taking no food till three o'clock in the afternoon. They spoke of Holy Communion as a sacrifice, taught a doctrine of the Real Presence; mixed water with the sacramental wine, kept all saints' days and holy days, held the doctrine of apostolic succession and believed that none but those episcopally ordained should administer the Sacraments (*see* pp. 17-18).

Then in the order of time comes the Moravian influence with its mysticism and pietism, its deep sense of Christian fellowship, but also its confident belief that it was possible to know one's sins were forgiven, to know a personal Saviour. And thus came the *irregularities*, some of which are summed up in John Wesley's famous expression, "I look upon all the world as my parish," and Charles's claim to baptize "in any part of the known world," and in the erection of buildings for the use of religious societies. Thence resulted the Methodists as distinguished from the Evangelicals within the Church of England, and then further the division of Methodists and Calvinistic Methodists. In this movement there were other personalities than the two Wesleys, though John Wesley stood out amongst them all. There was George Whitefield the

preacher, Selina Countess of Huntingdon, Howell Harris, Benjamin Ingham and others. Mr. Harrison devotes one chapter to *Personalities*, but the more important of them constantly meet us throughout the pages of the book.

Of the doctrine of the first Methodists we read: "All the forty-four standard sermons of Wesley are concerned with the experience of salvation and practical Christianity. Methodist preaching was concentrated there. The Cross is the way of Reconciliation, faith is the means, and joy in the Witness of the Spirit is the result. . . Wesley puts his sermons on what he calls speculative doctrines outside the four volumes that contain the preaching standards. The Trinity, the Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Future Life, the Church and even Predestination are dealt with in the later volumes. . . The Catholic faith was preserved for his people, not by the constant use of the Prayer Book but by the hymn-book they loved . . . There are hymns for all the great seasons of the Christian year . . . It was the Methodists who revived the frequent celebration of Holy Communion in the Church of England. They recovered the meaning of the New Testament Church in their loving fellowships. It may well be argued that the Evangelical Revival created more orthodox Christians than any popular movement of religion in the history of the Church" (pp. 87, 88).

The last chapter deals with steps towards reunion. Here the author visualizes the Church of England to be in the main Protestant, hence he says, "there is no doctrinal difficulty in the way of reunion" (p. 195). In his final page he pleads: "The 'Catholic' views with which we are so familiar in this country are altogether too parochial. It is clear that they constitute the chief problem for the Anglican Church in any scheme of reunion. If the Free Churches of this country and the Church of England came together in a real fellowship, the Anglican compromise would be thrown out of balance. The Anglo-Catholic should, however, take courage. He would find a new field for fresh conquests. Nonconformity has a sense of sacramental and institutional values in its Church life and latent possibility from much enlightenment in 'Catholic' doctrine. After all, *Magna est veritas et praevalerebit*" (p. 201).

This raises many questions; is this a tentative desire to be enlightened? It is certainly possible for Catholicism to be held in a sectarian way. Perhaps the best hope of reunion is the present platform of Christian co-operation—living and working out Christian principles together without any compromise in regard to the dogmas of the Faith. Years so lived



may well bring a real understanding and so prepare us for the work of the Holy Spirit !

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

*The Second Spring*, 1818-52. By Denis Gwynn. (Burns, Oates.) 9s.

Mr. Gwynn here gives a useful outline of the amazing developments of the Church in England in the first half of the nineteenth century, weaving into a pleasant well-ordered narrative the data available in a series of weighty biographies and other works. Here we have the Cambridge converts, the Oxford Movement, the foreign missionaries, the Old Catholics ; the Churchmen : Wiseman, Walsh, Ullathorne, Newman, Faber, Barberi, Gentili, Spencer ; the heroically devoted laymen, for whom one feels a special admiration and sympathy : Digby, Phillipps, Lord Shrewsbury, Pugin. They were great men and have left us a great example. We can learn, too, from their weaknesses—those personal misunderstandings and unnecessary intolerances. It is regrettable to read of these as it is to note that even in that heroic age Wiseman was grieved by religious orders which allowed their rules to prevent them from performing work of urgent necessity for the Church. In general the story sees raised many of the problems with which we still have to deal. The second spring has turned out, perhaps, as Newman presaged, an English spring ; “and as that suffering of the Martyrs is not recompensed, so, perchance, it is not yet exhausted” ; bitter storms may yet lie ahead.

Other impressive words of Newman's are quoted. “When was a great schism ever healed ? Why should ours cease, if that between East and West has continued so long ? And if a growth in sanctity be the necessary condition of it in both parties, what stipulation can be more costly, more hopeless ? No, I feel that both parties must resign themselves to dying in their estrangement ; but there is no reason why they should not . . . both pray and labour against it.”

The book is familiar in theme, customary in emphasis, but it provides abundant matter for thought and inspiration.

W.T.R.

*Revelation and Reunion: A Response to Tambaram.* By Gerald Webb Broomfield O.B.E., M.A., D.D. (Oxon.), Hon. Canon of Zanzibar, etc. (London: S.P.C.K. 1942.) Pp. 224. 7s. 6d.

The occasion of this book was a statement on Christian unity issued by delegates of the so-called Younger Churches (India, China, Japan, Africa and elsewhere) at the meeting of the International Missionary Council which met at Tambaram, near Madras, in 1938. In his capacity of general secretary of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa and as a member of various missionary bodies, Dr. Broomfield is well acquainted with the desires, mentality and beliefs of both Anglican and non-Anglican bodies of Christianity. As a theologian and distinguished scholar of Holy Scripture one would rightly expect a serious treatment of both *Revelation* and *Reunion*, which are the two themes of his work.

The book is indeed an uncommonly sincere and tactful piece of work with a humility of mind and power of vision which are rare. In fact, the book is so beautiful in conception that it is a disgraceful task to have to point to weaknesses which would seem in the eyes of a large body of Christians to defeat its purpose. If, then, I offer some criticisms it is my wish that they be taken as part of that Roman Catholic contribution which the author expects us to make towards the solution of the final issue.

The book opens the discussion with a strong chapter on the Path of Union. I cannot do better than sum up the main argument by a few quotations. "That the Church should achieve unity is a matter of vital importance to the world and to the Church itself. . . The military strength of Anti-Christ may be broken by greater force of the same kind; but what then? Such a victory, necessary though it may be, is less than half the battle. . . Nations, no less than individuals, must recognize the supremacy of the moral law. . . Nor can any nation or individual obey it save by the grace of God. . . Christianity alone can save the nations. . . But the Christianity which the world needs is no mere system of individual faith, right conduct and worship. The whole possibility of the new order of civilization, of which we dream, depends on the creation of a new spirit of fellowship between individuals, between classes, and also between nations and races. Friendly co-operation on the basis of mutual interests is not enough. . . The fellowship which the world needs can only come from the religion of Christ; it must, in fact, *be* the fellowship of the religion of Christ. This fellowship is the Church...

What the world needs, therefore, is not only Christianity, not only the Church, but a Church which is united. Unless the Church can, in its own corporate life, realise the fellowship of which it alone holds the secret, there will be no effective cure for national antagonisms. That the Church should achieve a unity which is a real embodiment of Christian brotherhood is a matter of life and death for modern civilization" (pp. 1-3). From this general consideration the author passes on to the interior need for unity of the Church itself. The scandal of preaching a gospel of love to pagan nations whilst presenting them with a picture of a broken-up brotherhood cannot help the effectiveness of the Gospel's message. The advantage that would come to the West if it could embrace the intellectual and mystical possibilities of, say, Chinese and Indian Christians would be immense. Such a universalism, truly Catholic, would help much to maintain a balance of emphasis in doctrine and practice. Lastly, this universal union is the explicit wish of Christ for the fulfilment of His universal redemption. He made that clear on the eve of His glorious passion and this cancels any attempt at justifying our indifference towards our mutual separation, alas, too common a feature of both Catholic and non-Catholic forms of Christianity in the West and the near East. Speaking of the contribution which each Christian body could make towards the whole, the author says: "If what I have said is true, no Christian bodies should be expected to give up or treat as indifferent, for the sake of reunion, the things which distinguish their own life and thought. . . It is true that some of them may have to be modified before reunion can be complete, but the modification must arise from a clearer understanding of the truth underlying them and their alternatives, and not simply from the desire for unity" (p. 10).

But when the author rejects the claim of any body of Christians that all others must conform to its standard of faith and order, ultimately, because "we believe the Holy Spirit has given us a vision of a Church which shall attain to a fuller, richer and more truly balanced conception of the Church," he lays himself open to self-contradiction because he asks without justification one very large body of Christians to give up "the things which distinguish their own life and thought." The Catholic Church is well aware of the obvious human limitations in her formulation of faith and order; she also admits of an organic development from the implicit to the explicit in a constant endeavour towards the fulness of Christ. But she is equally convinced that the Holy Spirit cannot at the same time inspire contradictory doctrines in

His Church and in individuals outside this Church. She holds that the plenitude of union must be the organic and intrinsic development of the seed sown in her own body and not an amalgam of heterogeneous bodies. If Christ did not found a church which would not consistently be in possession of the basic unity of faith and order, He would have built a house on sand and leave no definite and concrete norm to those that wished to follow Him. And so we have it in the baptismal rite where the question is asked: "What askest thou *of the Church*?" and the answer is given: "The faith."

The same applies to the question of full dogmatic agreement as a preliminary to union. For Catholics the reason of this demand lies in the very unity of the faith. What non-Catholics sometimes are perhaps apt to forget is that, since their particular group has come into existence by reaction towards one or another point, they are less sensitive to the wholeness of the faith. For the Catholic Church faith is one because it is the revelation of the one whole Truth, God Himself. Any denial of any part of this faith is for a Catholic nothing less than a denial of God's own truth. It is therefore, in a way, immaterial which point is denied. It all makes one whole, one reality, one world, one God, one faith, one baptism and one Church, visible and invisible because the Incarnation is both the visible and invisible revelation of the one God. And if this is accepted, it becomes clearer, too, that Catholicism implies the acceptance of a divine order and faith, according to the Divinely appointed channels. A Catholic finds it very difficult to understand how one can be so sure of having received a personal revelation through the Holy Ghost, clear enough to be made equal to the claims of the Church (of whom alone Christ said that the gates of hell would not prevail over her) and still more to present a merely personal vision so confidently for the acceptance of all. There is here something that jars on a genuine Catholic temperament.

This leads me to another point. The first part of the book, after the introductory chapter, treats in three chapters of the formation of our belief. But faith is here defined as merely "confidence in a person or in a body of persons" (p. 46). But surely faith and confidence are two entirely distinct things. There is a modern tendency to treat faith rather loosely as a matter of feeling or experience. Confidence is such a feeling. Faith is the acceptance of a divinely revealed truth by the mind on the authority of God Himself. It is an adhesion of the mind prompted by the will, and since the truth to which the mind is to adhere is beyond reason and the mere human forces altogether it requires a "supernatural" faculty, grafted



upon the mind, in order to enable it to grasp a "supernatural truth." What is true in Dr. Broomfield's treatment applies to the process which *precedes* the act of faith, not to faith itself. It is really a pity that when such genuine efforts are made towards mutual understanding so little notice is taken of authentic expositions of the matter in hand. In this case, I feel sure, the chapters on belief would have been written differently if authors like Father Gardeil and Garrigou-Lagrange (especially the latter's *De Revelatione*) had been consulted. We may find their language somewhat scholastically uncouth but they give a true *exposé* of the matter from the Catholic point of view.

The second part treats more explicitly of the author's view of union. The way he brings out the vital point of seeing the positive contribution which each existing Christian body can make is so illuminating and such a clear development of what was said in Father Congar's *Divided Christendom* that it is to be hoped that many will read it. It is perhaps a little painful for Catholics to find how unsatisfactorily the author treats of the primacy of St. Peter whilst he has shown such a firm grip of the Church as the instrument of God's revelation in previous passages. Again, if faith is taken as a whole, and Holy Scripture, tradition and the organic development of the Church's teaching under the guidance of the Holy Ghost are seen as mutually unfolding one single truth, the primacy of St. Peter does not really give more difficulty than the other tenets of Catholic belief.

These criticisms, as I said before, are offered in the spirit of a contribution to the very message which Dr. Broomfield seeks to convey, and which, taken as a whole, contains such a wealth of broadening vistas and possibilities of approach that one cannot help praising the book as a marked step forward in the right direction. One would wish, on the whole, that his request for more genuine mutual understanding would lead to a better first-hand knowledge of each other's position, on the lines of the great Johann Möhler's *Symbolik*. There is perhaps a not altogether justifiable shyness on the part of non-Catholics to quote Catholic authors, especially necessary when the Catholic position is drawn into the discussion. It is to be hoped that the various bodies that met at Tambaram will not fail to take Dr. Broomfield's response into account.

T.W.

*How Christians Worship.* Broadcast talks edited by the Rev. J. Eric Fenn. (The Student Christian Movement Press Ltd. London, 1942.) Pp. 111. 2s. 6d.

The B.B.C. ought to be congratulated on this excellent series of broadcasts. The treatment, the choice of the speakers, the intelligent limitation are all a matter of joy for those who will care to read these talks in book form.

After a finely tactful introduction of this presentation of many forms of English worship by the editor, the series is opened by two important talks given by Dr. Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury. He speaks of the relations between worship and life and gives an almost patristic paraphrase of the Our Father. "There was never a worse definition of religion than Professor Whitehead's often quoted phrase, 'Religion is what a man does with his solitariness,'" leads Dr. Temple to a tense and convincing exposition of the primary social value of religion. His two fundamental talks are followed by three historical talks, one on the early Church by the Rev. E. C. Ratcliff (based mainly on St. Justin's description), another one on parish worship in the Middle Ages by Professor Margaret Deanesly (illustrated by quotations from a versified *Lay Folks' Mass Book*) and a third one on the effect of the Reformation by the Rev. E. R. Micklem where it is frankly admitted that the reformers failed to achieve their intentions (this does not mean that anyone is obliged to admit without more ado the loftiness of their intentions. The question *why* they failed has some importance). The Church of England is represented by three talks, one on Evensong, one on Communion and one on the language of the Prayer Book. When the Rev. A. S. Reeve frankly rejects the reiteration of the Sacrifice of the Mass and the reality of Christ's Body and Blood in the Holy Sacrament, one may question how far he is representative of Anglican belief. Even if this purely Protestant interpretation is still held by a numerical majority of Anglicans, there is no doubt an important section among them with a more orthodox belief, a section which has now become too numerous and too important to be left out of the picture without more ado. Presbyterianism is capably presented by the Rev. Nevile Davidson, and Methodism equally attractively by the Rev. Francis James. Both these talks are very illuminative of the sincerity of English individual piety and make instructive reading for Catholics, even if they cannot agree with the systems. It was a happy choice to invite Dom Bernard McElligott for the talk on Catholic worship and he amply deserves the praise given to him in the introductory talk by



the Rev. J. Eric Fenn. The Quakers are represented by Eric Hayman, of the Society of Friends and he is equally felicitous in presenting the positive side of his picture. The talks finish with a discussion by the Rev. F. A. Iremonger on Broadcasting and Worship, lively and genuine.

The whole of these talks displays a spirit of respect towards one another and a serious endeavour to bring forward the more positive aspects of these various forms of worship, which make them delightful and instructive reading for any Catholic who is aware of what is going to be one of the major issues for the Church in the future.

T.W.

*The Saints of the Year.* By Dom Cuthbert Smith. (St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate.) Pp. 114. 5s.

This is a very welcome companion to the Roman Missal. How often do the laity (and priests too) want to know something about the saints whose feasts are kept or commemorated at the daily Mass that they attend. This is the purpose of the little book before us. It certainly meets a need. We understand there are only a limited number of copies printed.

B.W.

